University of Alberta

The Spiritual Alphabet : St. Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov's Rhetorical Program for Inward Knowledge

by

Dushan Bednarsky ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in

Ukrainian Literature

Department of Slavic and East European Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 1998

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-34734-6

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Dushan Bednarsky

Title of Thesis: *The Spiritual Alphabet*: St. Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov's Rhetorical Program for Inward Knowledge

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 1998

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

D. Bednarsky

1-10214-116 Street NW
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 1W4

8 October 1998

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "*The Spiritual Alphabet*: St. Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov's Rhetorical Program for Inward Knowledge" submitted by Dushan Bednarsky in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Ukrainian Literature.

Peter Rolland

Dr. Peter Rolland

Milan V. Dimić

Dr. Milan Dimic

EMożejko

Dr. Edward Mozejko

Dr. Bohdan Medwidsky

Dr. Larry McKill

Dr. Giovanna Brogi Bercoff

October 7, 1998

Abstract

This thesis analyzes of the works of St. Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov (1651–1709) within the context of late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century Orthodox Slavic religious philosophy, Christian post-Renaissance religious thought and Early Modern rhetoric. The primary text is the author's *Spiritual Alphabet;* secondary texts include his sermons, saints' lives and dramatic works. The methodology employed is a synthesis of these texts that demonstrates the author's application of the five principles of rhetoric—invention, disposition, elocution, memory and pronunciation—to a sequential and orderly program for the acquisition of spiritual knowledge. Chapter one discusses the soul's inventiveness. Dymytrii's concept of spiritual inventiveness is deeply rooted in Christian ethics, neo-Platonic philosophy and a Renaissance humanist emphasis on philology and rhetoric. Chapter two discusses the soul's disposition. The human being's happiness depends upon the harmonious agreement of all his component parts: the body, the interior soul, the exterior soul. Chapter three discusses the soul's elocution. Spiritual elocution is the task of giving force to spiritual understanding through good deeds and acts of charity. Good works constitute the power and eloquence that accompany spiritual inventiveness and harmonious disposition. Chapter four discusses the soul's memory. Spiritual memory entails sensibility and good perception in the work of spiritual living. The senses may easily lead the Christian astray if he does not possess the requisite mindfulness that tempers his perceptions and allows him to discern between truth and falsehood. Chapter five discusses the soul's pronunciation. Spiritual pronunciation consists of the human being's dialogue with God through prayer. It is a voluntary and individual devotion that takes place in the interior chamber of the human heart.

This thesis proposes that neo-Platonic philosophy, rather than Aristotelian, was dominant in Dymytrii's writing. In this respect it constitutes a new interpretation of Dymytrii's theological thought and literary work, since Aristotelianism is generally considered the dominant philosophical ground of early eighteenth-century Russian and Ukrainian culture. The thesis demonstrates that Dymytrii's rhetorical and neo-Platonic approach for the acquisition of spiritual wisdom originated in his desire to conciliate Western humanist intellectual tradition with the patristic sources of his Orthodox faith.

For my maternal grandmother,

Anne (née Bednarska) Zowtuk

Preface

Style

The style used is that of the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*, fourth edition (New York: MLA, 1995).

Transliteration

My principle of transiteration from Cyrillic is to render the transliterated text as readable as possible, while at the same time allowing the reader to reconstruct the original text with reasonable proximity:

1. Simplified Library of Congress in chapter text: no soft and hard signs; surname ending *-s'kyi* is simplifed as -sky (e.g. Stefan Iavorsky). No ligatures are used.

2. Modified Library of Congress in footnote citations and bibliography: soft and hard signs represented by (') and (") (e.g. Stefan Iavors'kyi). Also used for linguistic material in text. Nineteenth-century Russian titles are modernized: i.e., hard signs at the end of words are removed. No ligatures are used.

Thus:

According to Makhnovets (Makhnovets' 1: 374) . . .

3. Church Slavonic alphabet is transliterated using a modified civil Cyrillic alphabet. The jus characters ѧ, ѫ are replaced with я and ю. The theta ѳ, psi ѱ and izhitsa ѵ characters are retained (e.g., Паѵелъ, тѵмпанѣ).

Use of brackets and parentheses:

1. brackets are used as parentheses within parentheses;

2. brackets are used for my editorial insertions, explanations into quoted text;

3. parentheses are the author's own (i.e. my own, or the source cited) parenthetical insertions.

Roman numerals and classical citations:

Roman numerals are everywhere transliterated as Arabic, except when they are used in titles.

Hence:

Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. H. Rackam (London: Cambridge UP, 1942) III.xx.76.

is given as:

> Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. H. Rackam (London: Cambridge UP, 1942) 3.20.76.

But:

> John Donne, "Holy Sonnet V," *The Divine Poems*, ed. Helen Gardner (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1952) 13.

Citations from classical authors will contain the customary book, section, and line numbers. Corresponding volume and page numbers from the edition cited will be given in parentheses.

Thus:

> Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. H. Rackam (London: Cambridge UP, 1942) 3.20.76 (2: 76).

Acknowledgement

I thank my supervisor Dr. Peter Rolland for his patience, hard work and moral support throughout my doctoral program. The writing of this thesis would not have been possible without his strong encouragement and direction. I thank the other two members of my supervisory committee, Drs. Milan Dimic and Edward Mozejko, for their sound advice and critical evaluation of my work. I also thank Drs. Larry McKill and Bohdan Medwidsky for serving on my final examining committee. I give special thanks to Dr. Giovanna Brogi Bercoff for serving as my external examiner. I thank Dr. Tom Priestly for chairing my final examination. I thank the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, especially Dr. Linda McDonald for her support and sound professional advice. I thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for awarding me a doctoral fellowship during the years 1992 to 1995. I thank the Department of Slavic and East European Studies staff, namely Janet Ould, Jean Wilman and Doreen Hawryshko. I thank the Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies staff, particularly Jane Wilson. I thank the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, especially Drs. Zenon Kohut, Frank Sysyn, Frances Swyripa and Serhii Plokhy for their support and encouragement. I thank Dr. Andrij Hornjatkevyč for his assistance with my Slavonic-English translations. I thank the Graduate Students' Association, especially our capable ombudsmen Barry Posner and Saloni Negi. I thank the graduate students of the department, particularly Natalia Burianyk and Oksana Krys. I thank my family and friends, especially my mother Mary Goshko, my grandmother Anne Zowtuk, and my good friends Peter Zalucky and Barbara Mazur. Finally, I thank Father Stephan Jarmus for introducing me to St. Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, when I was a seventeen-year-old student of theology at St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter One: *Inventio Spiritualis* 46

Chapter Two:*Dispositio Spiritualis* 102

Chapter Three: *Elocutio Spiritualis* 148

Chapter Four: *Memoria Spiritualis* 183

Chapter Five: *Pronunciatio Spiritualis* 230

Conclusion 265

Bibliography 275

Appendix 294

Introduction

The life of St. Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov (Danylo Savych Tuptalo, 1651–1709) begins and ends with two profound changes in the course of Ukrainian history: the period of the internal strife and warfare known as the "Ruin" (1650-1670) and the movement of Ukrainian intellectual life to the territory of Muscovy during the reign of Peter the Great.[1] These two events frame the course of his development as a cleric and pastor and as a thinker. As a child he witnessed the waste and destruction of his homeland at the hands of foreigners and of his own people. As an adult he occupied himself in the task of rebuilding his society from the "Ruin's" twenty-year legacy of physical and spiritual destruction. As a man in his fifties he emigrated from Ukraine to participate in Peter the Great's dramatic transformation of Russia from a medieval society into a modern Western state. The paradoxes of human nature—its self-destructiveness and evil on the one hand, and its spiritual and intellectual nobility on the other—are always present in his thoughts and writings. The restoration of the past and the exploration of the new are themes that hold a special resonance for a man who was deeply involved in tasks of cultural and spiritual renovation and innovation.

Dymytrii was born in 1651 in the village of Makariv, near Kyiv. His father was Sava Hryhorovych Tuptalo, Cossack captain (*sotnyk*) of the Kyiv regiment. His mother, Maria Mykhailivna, was also from a Cossack family. Dymytrii was baptized with the name Danylo. Later, at the age of seventeen, he chose his monastic name in memory of St. Demetrius of Thessalonica, on whose day he received his monastic tonsure. Throughout his life he identified himself by his monastic name Dymytrii and his patronymic Savych.[2] The young Danylo spent his childhood in Kyiv's merchant district, the Lower Town (Ukrainian *podil*), an area of the city that endured frequent military bombardments throughout the "Ruin." His family's house was located between the still existing church of St. Nicholas Prytysky and the Floriv Convent. Despite the regular fires and periodic destruction, the Lower Town continued to serve as Kyiv's social and economic center throughout Dymytrii's lifetime. As a child and as a youth he would have been familiar with the Lower Town's numerous religious and educational institutions—and with the numerous vices and evils typical of an urban district inhabited by merchants, tradesmen and soldiers. Dymytrii's profound insight into the human psyche, his understanding of human weakness, and his deep compassion for others, reveal a man whose heart was well-acquainted with the follies and passions of the human condition.

---

[1] By far the definitive biography of Dymytrii remains Illia Shliapkin's extraordinary book *Sviatyi Dimitrii Rostovskii i ego vremia* (St. Petersburg, 1891). Also useful are: Aleksandr Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1898) 2: 400–16; Ivan Ohienko (Metropolitan Ilarion), *Sviatyi Dymytrii Tuptalo* (Winnipeg: Vira i Kul'tura, 1960); Viktor Askochenskii's *Kiev s drevneishim ego uchilishchem akademieiu* (Kyiv, 1856) 1: 219–28.

As a child Dymytrii studied at the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium, attached to the Theophany Confraternity Monastery located in Kyiv's Lower Town. The school's pedogogical program was based on the best educational models available in the seventeenth century, including humanist and Jesuit. For a total of three years (1662–65) Dymytrii studied the liberal arts in accordance with the Collegium's pedagogical sequence emphasizing grammar and rhetoric. His education, however, was terminated prematurely due to Hetman Petro Doroshenko's bombardment of the Lower Town in 1665, which left the Confraternity Monastery and its school in ruins. Forced by these circumstances to abandon the ruined Collegium, the fourteen-year old Danylo terminated his formal education and never completed his studies.[3] For this reason he never completed the higher levels of the humanist trivium-quadrivium sequence, namely the subjects of poetics and rhetoric and the limited instruction that was offered in philosophy and theology.[4] Instead, he became a self-taught rhetorician and theologian, utilizing his large personal library collection, much of which was obtained with the assistance of his later friend and spiritual mentor, Varlaam Iasynsky.[5]

---

[2] According to Illia Shliapkin the surname "Tuptalo" was never used by Dymytrii himself nor by any family member other than his father. "Tuptalo" was Sava Tuptalo's own personal surname, derived from the word *tupaty* (i.e. "to stamp one's feet"). The form "Savych"—in addition to being Dymytrii's own patronymic—had also been in use as the family surname since the beginning of the seventeenth century. Writing in 1891, Shliapkin explained that Dymytrii's relatives continue to live in Kyiv and identify themselves by the surname Savych, not Tuptalo. See Shliapkin1.

Although never completed, Dymytrii's education at the Kyiv Collegium was crucial for his intellectual development, for it was at this school that he would have been nurtured in an educational system that drew upon the pedagogical innovations of Erasmus and Loyola. The four basic elements that constitute Erasmus' approach to teaching the art of Christian living are identical to Dymytrii's own inventive sources:[6]

1. philology;
2. study of the classics;
3. study of scripture and of patristic literature;
4. inner devotion and the imitation of Christ;

---

[3] Ohienko suggests that Dymytrii may have had private tutors following the closing of the school (Ohienko, *Sviatyi Dymytrii Tuptalo* 23). Although this could be possible, Dymytrii himself makes no mention of having received such instruction.

[4] According to Alexander Jabłonowski there was little or no academic activity at the Collegium during the period 1665–69 (Jabłonowski, *Akademia kijowsko-Mohilańska* [Cracow, 1899–1900] 139–41). For more on the status of the Collegium during the period of the Hetmanate, see George Gajecky, "The Kiev Mohyla Academy and the Hetmanate," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8.1/2 (June, 1984): 81–92.

[5] Iasynsky was hegumen of the Confraternity Monastery during the period 1665-73. However, the Collegium's return to a regular academic program was apparently slow—as late as 1673 one of the monks of the monastery remarked, in Polish, "W szkołach porządku i nauki mało" ("there is neither much order nor teaching in the school"). See Jabłonowski 160.

[6] I have borrowed this list of four from Mary Giles, *The Poetics of Love: Meditations with John of the Cross* (New York: P. Lang, 1986) 6.

The Kyiv Collegium borrowed its modern pedagogical methods from the humanist and Jesuit models of Western Europe—particularly those of seventeenth-century Poland. However, it was above all else an Orthodox school created for the purpose of intellectually fortifying the Kyivan Orthodox Church in the presence of a dynamic and revitalized post-Reformation Polish Catholic Church. The Collegium's teaching methods were borrowed from the West, but the program's emphasis on scriptures and the Church Fathers served the goal of preserving and strengthening the Orthodox creed and the Eastern liturgy on its historical territory among the East Slavs.

Thus, Dymytrii's education at the Kyiv Collegium gave him entry into a community of Ukrainian and Belarusian clerics and scholars—all of whom enjoyed social and intellectual ties based on their *alma mater.* They shared a common humanist background in philology and classics, a common belief in the Orthodox faith, and a common interest in ensuring that this faith continued to flourish in its traditional homeland.

Following the school's closure, Dymytrii entered St. Cyril's Monastery on the northern periphery of Kyiv. His family had close ties with this monastery: his father, Sava Tuptalo, was one of the monastery's benefactors and was later buried there. Dymytrii's three sisters, Pamfiliia, Fevroniia and Paraskeva, received their monastic tonsure at the nearby St. Nicholas-Iordansky convent. In 1668 Dymytrii was tonsured a monk at St. Cyril's Monastery and thus embarked upon a life-long career in the church. Dymytrii remained there for six years, until his ordination to the priesthood in 1675 at the Hustyn Monastery in the Chernihiv eparchy. He received his priestly ordination at the hand of Archbishop Lazar Baranovych of Chernihiv, who later exerted considerable influence on Dymytrii's future career in the church. It was in the city of Chernihiv itself—and the Archbishop's request—that Dymytrii immediately began his career as a professional preacher (*kaznodii*). It was also during this same period, 1675–77, that he wrote his first published work, *The Bedewed Fleece* (*Runo oroshennoe*), commemorating the miracle-working icon of the Virgin Mary of the Chernihiv-St. Elias Monastery.

In the summer of 1677 Dymytrii embarked on an extended tour into Right-Bank Ukraine and beyond. His fame as a preacher preceded him, and he was invited to stay and preach at a number of locations, including Novyi Dvir (in Volhynia), Vilnius (the capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania), Slutsk (in Belarus) and Lublin (on the eastern border of contemporary Poland). He returned to Left-Bank Ukraine in 1679, and at the request of the Ukrainian Hetman Petro Doroshenko was called to serve as priest of the St. Nicholas-Krupytsky Monastery in Baturyn. This was no minor clerical appointment: throughout the latter part of the seventeenth century the town of Baturyn was the center of political life in Ukraine. It was here that Hetmans Doroshenko, Samoilovych and Mazepa successively held court, and the St. Nicholas Monastery stood at the center of the court's religious life. Dymytrii enjoyed close ties with all three of these hetmans, acknowledging them as his patrons and benefactors. He served several appointments at the Baturyn monastery over the next fifteen years, delivering sermons to an audience of influential courtiers and political figures that regularly included the most powerful man in Ukraine himself—the hetman. Dymytrii temporarily left Baturyn during the period 1681–83, during which he served at the Transfiguration Monastery in Maksakivka. He then returned to Baturyn, where he spent the winter of 1683–84.

In the spring of 1684, Metropolitan Varlaam Iasynsky called Dymytrii to Kyiv to receive a special commission, one that was to occupy Dymytrii's intellectual and creative energies for most of his remaining life. Iasynsky gave Dymytrii the task of researching and writing a complete *Reading Menaea*

(Slavonic: *Cheti-Minei*) or *Lives of the Saints* in Slavonic. The *Reading Menaea* was to include all the saints on the Orthodox Church calendar. Such a comprehensive project had never before been attempted in Ukraine and the task was a daunting one. Dymytrii's commission was to produce a scholarly text that embodied the most modern approaches to historical and hagiographic research, involving exhaustive research of primary sources. Naturally, the model that was emulated was the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandist Brethren. Although Dymytrii's finished work was considerably more modest than the Bollandists' colossal effort (to this day the Bollandists have not yet completed their enterprise), he did not complete it until over twenty years later, in 1705.

It was also in 1684 in Kyiv that Dymytrii first met Stefan Iavorsky. The two men formed a life-long friendship—twenty-five years later it was Iavorsky who would deliver Dymytrii's funeral oration and compose the verses that would adorn his tomb.

In 1686 Dymytrii returned to Baturyn for the third time, and remained there until 1694. In the summer of 1689 the first volume of Dymytrii's *Reading Menaea* was published. However, in September of that year Dymytrii travelled to Moscow as part of Hetman Ivan Mazepa's entourage, and there he was chastised by Patriarch Ioakim of Moscow for including the Latin Fathers Augustine and Jerome among the Orthodox saints. At this same time Dymytrii requested the loan of a precious manuscript housed in the Kremlin's Dormition Cathedral—the Slavonic *Reading Menaea* of Metropolitan Makarii, compiled during the years 1530–54. Patriarch Ioakim declined, and offered Dymytrii an icon of the Virgin Mary instead. It was not until after Ioakim's death that his successor, Patriarch Adrian, approved the loan of this valuable manuscript to Dymytrii, crucial for his research in connection with the remaining volumes of his *Reading Menaea*.

While in Moscow Dymytrii participated in a bitter dispute with religious conservatives in Moscow, culminating in the execution of his colleague Silvestr Medvedev for heresy.[7] The trial pitted traditionalists, such as Patriarch Ioakim and the monk Evfimii Chudovsky, against Orthodox clerics influenced by Counter-Reformation Western theology, represented by Medvedev and his associates. The execution of Medvedev was politically motivated by the Tsar, Peter, who had recently overthrown the regency of his half-sister, Sophia, and was systematically purging the court of Sophia's supporters, including Medvedev. The heresy charge concerned a minor question regarding the appropriateness of kneeling at certain times during the consecration of the bread and wine during the Divine Liturgy. Dymytrii did his best to calm this situation, emphasizing Orthodox sacramentology and the teaching of the Church Fathers that the precise time of the transubstantiation is a mystery known only to God. Nevertheless, the conservative Muscovite party prevailed: Medvedev was convicted of heresy and decapitated. The debate's emphasis on purely formalistic gestures and its deviation from the spirit of the Church Fathers left Dymytrii demoralized. Following the controversy he returned to Baturyn much disturbed by the entire incident.

In 1694 Dymytrii left Baturyn to take up an appointment as hegumen (abbot) of the St. Peter and St. Paul Monastery in Hlukhiv. He remained in Hlukhiv until 1697, and during this period his energies were diverted to the construction of a new masonry church for the monastery. While in Hlukhiv he did manage to complete the second volume of the *Reading Menaea*, which was published in 1695. Following the consecration of the Hlukhiv Monastery church in the early spring of 1697, Dymytrii served four months at St. Cyril's Monastery in Kyiv. In the summer of that same year, however, he was called back to Chernihiv to serve as archimandrite of the Chernihiv-Eletsky Monastery, where he served until the fall of 1699. In September, 1699 he left Chernihiv and took up a new appointment at the Transfiguration Monastery in Novhorod-Siversky, where he remained until 1701. During this period the third volume of his *Reading Menaea* was published in Kyiv in the year 1700. That same year he also published his *Apologia*, a pastoral treatise based on St. Paul's words "Wherefore comfort yourselves together, and edify one another" (1 Thess. 5.11).[8]

---

[7] Dymytrii's role in this unhappy debate is described by Grigorii Mirkovich in his O *vremeni presushchestvleniia sviatykh darov. Spor byvshii v Moskve, vo vtoroi polovine XVII-go veka (Opyt istoricheskago izsledovaniia)* (Vilnius, 1886). Illia Shliapklin also covers this debate extensively (Shliapkin176–266).

In 1701 Dymytrii was summoned to Moscow by Peter the Great and consecrated a bishop. Like many other clergymen educated in Kyiv he was recruited as part of Peter's plan to modernize the Russian Orthodox Church. Dymytrii was initially appointed to the Metropolitan see of Tobolsk and all Siberia. However, he protested that his advancing years and poor health were not suited to such a difficult posting. He spent the next nine months in Moscow, preaching in various churches and monasteries. Finally he received a less arduous posting, that of Metropolitan of Rostov, an ancient city located north-east of Moscow.

The Rostov eparchy, although less physically demanding than Siberia, was on the other hand much fragmented by religious dissent, intellectual decline, and social backwardness. Old Ritualism dominated religious life, leaving the official Orthodox Church in a precarious position. The Orthodox clergy were for the most part illiterate and church discipline virtually non-existent. Dymytrii commented on the appalling ignorance of his clergy, saying,

---

[8] See Leonid Makhnovets', *Ukrains'ki pys'mennyky: Bio-bibliohrafichnyi slovnyk* (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhnoi literatury, 1960)1: 571.

"The sower fails to sow, and the land does not accept seeds. The priests do not lead, and the people go astray. The priests do not teach, and the people remain ignorant. The priests do not preach God's word, and the people neither listen nor do they care to listen."[9] Dymytrii was particularly troubled by the poverty of sacramental life throughout the eparchy—not only did priests neglect to give Communion to the faithful, they even failed to partake of the sacrament themselves while serving the Divine Liturgy.

As Metropolitan, Dymytrii quickly took steps to normalize religious life in his eparchy. He established a Greek and Latin grammar school, attached to his own residence at the Rostov Kremlin and funded by the State Chancellery for Monasteries (*Monastyrs'kyi prikaz*). All educational expenses were paid for by the Chancellery, including the students' tuition, room, and board. When the school opened in 1702, there were two hundred students registered.[10] The school foundered, however, due to insufficient funding from the Chancellery, and by the beginning of 1706 the school ceased to function.[11]

The program that Dymytrii prepared for the Rostov school was based on his own education at the Kyiv Collegium, and it reflected the Kyiv school's humanist approach to learning, above all else emphasizing classical philology and Orthodox doctrine. At the end of the nineteenth century, Illia Shliapkin reconstructed the Rostov school program of 1702–1705, and proposed that the following subjects were taught during this period:[12]

---

[9] «Сѣятель не сѣетъ, а земля не принимаетъ. Іереи не брегутъ, а люди заблуждаются. Іереи не учатъ, а люди невѣжествуютъ. Іереи слова Божія не проповѣдуютъ, а люди не слушаютъ и слушатъ не хотятъ»—E. Poselianin, *Russkaia tserkov i russkie podvizhniki* (St. Petersburg, 1905) 39.

[10] For details on the founding of the Rostov school, see Shliapkin 329–30.

[11] «Оскупѣвше убо во всѣмъ, оскупѣхомъ и во ученіяхъ»—noted Dymytrii in a letter dated later that year on December 10, 1706. See Dymytrii's "Pisma k Iovu" in *Kafedral'nye Chernigovskie monastyri: Il'inskii, Eletskii i Borisoglebskii s prilozheniem neskol'kikh neizdannykh sochinenii Sviatitelia Dimitrii i mnogikh gramat* (Cherihiv, 1861) 156.

[12] See Shliapkin 330ff.

1. Reading in Slavonic taught first, followed by writing;
2. Music and singing, both sacred and secular;
3. Prayers;
4. The Decalogue;
5. Orthodox catechism;
6. Arithmetic;
7. Geography;
8. Greek;
9. Latin;
10. Polish.

According to Shliapkin, four grammar books were used at the Rostov school to teach Greek: a Latin *Rudimenta linguae graecae*, and three Greek textbooks, indentified as (1) Lascarius's grammar (2) a Greek grammar book published in the Western Ukrainian city of L'viv (3) an anonymous third grammar book.

The course in Latin followed Emmanuel Alvarez's textbook, *Institutiones linguae latinae.*[13] Three years were devoted to grammar—essentially the school's entire period of existence from the fall of 1702 to the winter of 1705. In accordance with Alvarez's sequence, the first topic to be studied was grammar, followed by syntax. Syntax was taught through the study of classical examples, including Ovid's *Actaeon* and Pliny's *Arachnae*. Written exercises likewise followed Alvarez's example and were divided into three types: (1) *exercitia* (2) *occupationes* (3) *compositiones.* Translations from Slavonic into Latin were assigned both as homework (*compositiones domesticae*) and as class work (*compositiones scholasticae*). Three teachers were employed at the school—two were from Ukraine and the third from Muscovy—and their tasks included the marking the students' exercise books. Rarely did the teachers correct the students' mistakes; instead, errors were marked in the exercise books and then returned to the students to correct in their free time.

---

[13] For a complete bibliography of Alvarez see Augustin de Backer, ed., *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Louvain: Éditions de la Bibliothèque S. J., 1960) 1: 223–50.

Shliapkin notes Dymytrii's particular affinity for music and the special role that he accorded this subject at the school.[14] Additionally, the Rostov school, like all humanist schools, considered theatre an essential part of the curriculum. Dymytrii composed several dramas for the Rostov school, including the well-known *Nativity Drama*.[15]

Throughout his tenure as Metropolitan of Rostov and during the operation of the school Dymytrii continued to write despite his failing health and an increasing fiscal crisis in his eparchy. To counter Old Ritualism, Dymytrii wrote a treatise entitled *Examination of the Schismatic Brynian Faith*, in which he pointed out the errors of the Old Ritualists and urged them to return to the official church.[16] In the year 1705 the fourth and final volume of Dymytrii's *Reading Menaea* was printed. That same year he also published his theological essay, "Deliberation Concerning God's Image and Likeness in Man."[17] Dymytrii's final years were occupied with writing his historical work, entitled *Chronicle Briefly Relating Events from the Creation of the World to the Birth of Christ*.[18] The *Chronicle* was above all else a religious history—a description of events from the Old Testament intended for clerical use. In this respect it reflected the author's humanist regard for history as a source for rhetorical invention: clerics must know the events of biblical history in order to preach the faith. History as a discipline independent of theology and rhetoric was unthinkable to Dymytrii.

---

[14] See Shliapkin 331.

[15] «Комедія на Рождество Христово»—published in Volodymyr Rezanov, *Drama ukrains'ka* (Kyiv: Ukrains'ka akademiia nauk, 1927) (reprint: Düsseldorff: Slavica, 1970) 4: 81–146. The only other drama that has survived in its entirety is Dymytrii's *Dormition Drama* (also published in Rezanov 5:191–238).

[16] I.e. «Розыск о расколнической брыской вѣрѣ»—In his lifetime this text existed only in manuscript form; it was not published until 1745. See Makhnovets' 1: 572.

[17] I.e. «Разсужденіе о образѣ Божіи и подобіи в человѣцѣ.» See Makhnovets' 1: 571.

[18] I.e. «Летопись иже во святыхъ иже отця нашего Димитрія, митрополита Ростовского, сказующая вкратце деяния от начала миробытия до рождества Христова.» The *Chronicle* was not published until the year 1784. See Makhnovets'1: 572.

Despite his ongoing productivity as a preacher and writer, the years 1706–9 saw Dymytrii's financial situation worsen. Early in the year 1706 it became evident that there was not enough money for him to continue living in Rostov. He moved to Moscow and spent the next year preaching in various churches and monasteries in that city.[19] His audience was frequently made up of courtiers, and on several occasions he preached before Tsar Peter himself. This one year that Dymytrii spent in Moscow appears to have kept him solvent during the period of fiscal crisis and he returned to Rostov in 1707. There he spent the last two years of his life amid failing health and ongoing financial problems.

Dymytrii passed away during the night of October 28, 1709 at the age of 58. During his final hours he requested singers to perform his "Spiritual Songs," a collection of his devotional poems set to his own musical arrangement.[20] Dymytrii was buried in the small ancient church of the Conception of St. Anne at the Holy Transfiguration-St. Iakov Monastery in Rostov. The St. Anne church had been in ruins when he arrived in Rostov in 1702, and the restoration of this building was one of his personal projects. He requested several of his own writings to be placed in his tomb. His life-long friend, Stefan Iavorsky, at the time Metropolitan of Riazan and *locum tenens* of the vacant patriarchal throne in Moscow, delivered the funeral oration.

Dymytrii was canonized a saint of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1757, although not without controversy. Metropolitan Arsenii Matseevich of Rostov and Iaroslav refused when asked to compose a Life for the new saint, probably reflecting an attitude among ecclesiastical bureaucrats that Dymytrii's writing posed a danger to Russian Imperial policy.[21] Nevertheless, Dymytrii's canonization took place, and he became one of only two saints to be canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church following the suppression of the Moscow Patriarchate and institution of the Holy Synod during the years 1721–1917. In the nineteenth century considerable interest arose in Dymytrii as a writer, and the majority of his manuscript works were tracked down in the various monastic libraries and private collections where they were scattered and many published for the first time.[22] Dymytrii's *Reading Menaea* was and continues to be the definitive hagiographic source throughout the Orthodox Slavic world, where it continues to circulate in facsimiles and in excerpts published in theological journals.

---

[19] Shliapkin 409–410.

[20] The "Spiritual Songs" (*Dukhovnye kanty*) and their musical arrangement were published in Aristarkh Izrailev, *Psalmy, ili Dukhovnye kanty Sviatitelia Dimitriia, Mitropolita Rostovskago* (Moscow, 1891).

Dymytrii's biography reveals an individual who received limited formal education but acquired broad erudition thanks to his own initiative and to the efforts of certain influential clerics who took an interest in him—in particular Lazar Baranovych, Varlaam Iasynsky and Stefan Iavorsky.[23] An autodidact—in Slavonic *samouk*—Dymytrii's intellectual development differed profoundly from many of his colleagues in the Orthodox church hierarchy of Belarus and Ukraine, the majority of whom at least completed the academic program in Kyiv, and many of whom studied at universities abroad. Dymytrii's self-taught knowledge in the fields of rhetoric, philosophy and theology set him apart from his contemporaries. Forced by circumstances to abandon the classroom, he came to rely on his own intellectual resources and on his own self-discipline. To satisfy his intellectual curiosity he became an avid reader. With no professors to guide him, Dymytrii turned directly to the scriptures and to the Church Fathers in his search for knowledge. Over the course of his lifetime he stocked his personal library with an abundance of Classical and Patristic sources, as well as contemporary neo-Latin theological and philosophical commentaries, Protestant and Catholic histories, and numerous books devoted to philology and grammar.[24]

---

[21] Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, "The 'Letopisec' of Dimitrij Tuptalo, The Metropolitan of Rostov, in the Context of Western European Culture," *Ricerche Slavistiche* 39-40/1 (1992-1993): 293.
[22] For a complete bibliography see Makhnovets' 1:570–581.
[23] According to Shliapkin, Dymytrii's private living quarters in Rostov were adorned with the portraits of four men: Sava Tuptalo, Lazar Baranovych, Varlaam Iasynsky, and Stefan Iavorsky. See Shliapkin 355.

Dymytrii's appetite for books was satisfied through a number of fortunate circumstances, including Iasynsky's mentorship, Dymytrii's own personal resources, and his travels throughout Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania and Muscovy. Throughout his lifetime he purchased books, ordering many of them from Western Europe via book dealers operating out of Gdansk.[25] Shliapkin notes that a substantial portion of Dymytrii's library collection was purchased late in his lifetime and transported to Rostov from the West via the northern Russian port of Arkhangelsk.[26]

Dymytrii's personal library reflected its owner's linguistic versatility.[27] He possessed several hundred books written in a number of languages, including Church Slavonic, Polish, Latin and Greek. Dymytrii's native language was the *lingua vulgara* of seventeenth-century Kyiv.[28] Eight of his sermons survive in which this linguistic medium is largely used (along with a rich sprinkling of Church Slavonic and Polish).[29] His personal diary was written in Polish, Latin and a Ukrainianized version of Church Slavonic. Most of Dymytrii's private letters were written in a mixture of *lingua vulgara* alternating with Latin, Polish and Church Slavonic. Official letters to ecclesiastical authorities, of course, were written in Church Slavonic. Dymytrii doubtless acquired knowledge of spoken Russian during his years in Rostov and Moscow. The bulk of his writing, however, survives in Church Slavonic, the *lingua sacra* of all Orthodox Slavs during this era. A number of Dymytrii's own Slavonic works sit upon his library shelves, including the manuscript copy of the *Spiritual Alphabet*, alongside the various Slavonic Bibles and theological texts that constituted a substantial portion of his collection.

---

[24] The content of Dymytrii's library collection is discussed in depth throughout Giovanna Brogi Bercoff's article. See also Max Okenfuss, *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia: Pagan Authors, Ukrainians, and the Resiliency of Muscovy* (Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1995) 105–9.

[25] In his diary Dymytrii recorded his excitement at the arrival of the eighteen-volume *Acta Sanctorum*, of the Bollandist Brethren, purchased from a book trader in Gdansk. See Dymytrii's diary excerpts published in his *Sochineniia sviatitelia Dimitriia, mitropolita Rostovskgo v 5-kh chastiakh* (Moscow, 1842)1: 457ff.

[26] Shliapkin 355.

[27] For a complete list of authors see Shliapkin's appendix .

[28] The term "Ruthenian" is sometimes used to desribe the common spoken language of the East Slavs of Belarus and Ukraine during the seventeenth century. See Bohdan Strumiński's essay

Of the approximately three hundred books recorded by Illia Shliapkin, two thirds are in Latin and Greek, reflecting the humanist reading habits that Dymytrii acquired at the Kyiv Collegium and his life-long interest in classical philology.[30] He was fluent in Polish and Latin, both of which were taught at the Kyiv Collegium. His knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, two languages that received relatively little, if any, attention during his school days in Kyiv, was doubtless self-taught. His self-taught knowledge of Greek was apparently good enough to enable him to teach this subject in Rostov. In a letter to his friend Iov Novgorodsky during that period he emphasized the importance of this classical

---

"Pre-nineteenth-century Ukrainian" in Riccardo Picchio, ed. *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question* (Columbus: Slavica, 1984) 2: 16ff.

[29] The language of these eight sermons deserves further study. The linguistic medium employed in these texts is essentially Western Ukrainian with many borrowings from Polish. These sermons are found in Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi sviatitelia Dimitriia, Mitropolita Rostovskago, na ukrainskom narechii*, ed. and intro. Andrei Titov (Moscow, 1909).

[30] For a wider perspective on humanist library collections see Csaba Csapodi's essay "Les bibliothèques humanistes" in Tibor Klaniczay, Eva Kushner and André Stegmann, eds., *L'époque de la Renaissance 1400–1600* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988) 1: 126–36.

language in the Rostov school's philological program.[31] Additionally he knew enough Hebrew to discuss certain aspects of sacred philology in connection with scriptures and patristic theology. In his sermons he sometimes deliberates on differences in translation between Hebrew and Greek biblical texts and their Slavonic translations. However, his library reveals that his knowledge of Greek patristics was based primarily on Latin translations, with a smaller number of patristic texts in Slavonic translation. Doubtless this was due to the scarcity of Greek editions in Kyiv and Moscow compared to the more easily acquired Latin and Slavonic translations.[32]

Dymytrii's philological interests, however, were secondary to his search for spiritual truth through pastoral and didactic work. Hence, the bulk of Dymytrii's library consisted of theology: Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Luther and Bonaventure stood side by side with John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzus. Jesuit authors are well represented in Dymytrii's collection: the Bollandists' *Acta Sanctorum*, a complete set of Cornelius a Lapide's scriptural commentaries and Caesar Baronius's *History of the Church* are all noteworthy. The scope of Dymytrii's reading interests extended well beyond the world of religion: his library had a core of classical authors, and he had an extensive collection of early-modern histories—primarily the works of German historiographers, Protestant and Catholic.[33] The very best authors and intellectuals of seventeenth-century Europe, including Bacon and Descartes, also took their place in his collection.

---

[31] «Ученіе, еже начало есть и источникъ всему любомудрію, еллиногреческій глаголю языкъ, отъ того бо вся премудрая ученія во вся языки произыдоша»—Shliapkin 332. Dymytrii was obviously sincere about the high value he accorded Greek—the numerous Greek grammar books, dictionaries, and primary sources in his personal library attest to his interest in this language.

[32] Dymytrii's library is discussed in the context of his contemporaries' collections in Okenfuss, *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia* 105–109.

[33] For a study of Dymytrii's collection of historical writings, and his use of these sources in his own historiographic work and research, see Giovanna Brogi Bercoff's article (cited in fn. 20, above).

Throughout his lifetime Dymytrii demonstrated an interest in world history and in the political circumstances that unfolded in his contemporary world. Dymytrii's sermons demonstrate this fascination of his: historical figures such as Anthony and Cleopatra appear in his sermons.[34] It has been suggested that in his sermons he was not afraid to make political allusions to the court of Tsar Peter I.[35] However, despite Max Okenfuss's suggestion that the Metropolitan of Rostov was as much a courtier as a cleric,[36] Dymytrii's spiritual writing reveals a man who believed that earthly kingdoms are secondary to the invisible kingdom of the human heart. His library, however, contained the best history books of this time.[37] His *Spiritual Alphabet* emphasizes that men and women should learn as much as they can from the present world and apply this knowledge to their salvation. These admonitions are not simply rhetorical devices; rather, the Metropolitan of Rostov held a deep conviction that the primary purpose of all knowledge is to draw the human being closer to God. In his *Alphabet* he makes it clear that all of man's actions, especially the education of children, must be directed to this goal.

A certain amount of mystery surrounds Dymytrii's own, practical endeavors in the field of education. He never studied rhetoric, and he does not appear ever to have taught it in any of the cities that he visited where this subject was taught, including Kyiv, Chernihiv, Vilnius or Moscow. As for the school that Dymytrii founded in Rostov, Shliapkin has pointed out that this school existed for a period of three years only, from 1702 to 1705. As proof that rhetoric was never taught in Rostov, Shliapkin offers the evidence that at least one of Dymytrii's students, a youth by the name of Ioann, was sent to Moscow to study rhetoric because this subject was not taught in Rostov.[38]

---

[34] The story of Anthony and Cleopatra is narrated by Dymytrii in his "Sermon for the Sunday of the Last Judgement" (Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 12–25). In this dissertation all citiations from the *Sochineniia* are from the 1842 edition published in Moscow.

[35] Dymytrii's use of classical mythology to disguise his criticism of abuses at Peter I's court is proposed by Ivan Ohienko (Ohienko, *Sviatyi Dymytrii Tuptalo* 65–68); Ohienko cites a sermon, preached by Dymytrii in Moscow in 1708, in which the Roman gods Venus, Bacchus and Mars personify the vices of Peter's court. See also Aleksander Pypin's *Istoriia russkoi literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1907)) 392–93.

[36] See Okenfuss, *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia* 105.

[37] Once again, I refer the reader to Giovanna Brogi Bercoff's article (see fn. 20, above).

Despite the fact that Dymytrii received no formal training in Ciceronian rhetoric, he was nevertheless a self-taught master of this art. His reputation as a gifted preacher in his own lifetime and the substantial corpus of homiletic works that he left behind bear eloquent testimony to his talent as an orator.[39] Although he himself received no formal instruction in rhetoric, he moved among clerics who did, particularly his close friend Stefan Iavorsky, author of the rhetorical manual entitled *The Rhetorical Hand in Five Parts.*[40] Dymytrii was also familiar with *Key of Understanding*, a rhetorical manual written by Ioanykii Galiatovsky, rector of the Kyiv Collegium during Dymytrii's brief student years.[41] Galiatovsky's work followed the Ciceronian model closely, and Dymytrii himself commented that the *Key of Understanding* was essential to his work.[42] Galiatovsky's *Key of Understanding* was modeled on Nicolai Caussini's *De Eloquentia Sacra et Humana*, and it was doubtless through Galiatovsky's text that Dymytrii became familiar with Caussini's humanist model for Ciceronian rhetoric.[43]

---

[38] Shliapkin 339.

[39] Dymytrii's adherence to the Ciceronian model is the subject of my M.A. thesis ("Dymytrij Tuptalo's Ukrainian Sermons: A Study in Kyivan Rhetoric" diss., University of Alberta, 1991). See also my article, "Ex abundantia enim cordis os loquitur: Dymytrij Tuptalo's Ukrainian Sermons and the Kievan Rhetorical Model," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 17.1–2 (1992): 217–243.

[40] Max Okenfuss mistakenly attributes to Dymytrii the 1707 *Ruka ritorisheskaia piatiiu chast'mi* of Stefan Iavorsky, published in *Izdanie Obshchestva Liubitelei Drevnei Pis'mennosti* 20 (1878): 596–98 (Okenfuss, *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism* 105).

[41] See the scholarly edition: Ioanykii Galiatovs'kyi, *Kliuch rozuminniia* , ed. I. Chepiha (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1985).

[42] Illia Shiapkin (Shliapkin127) quotes Dymytrii's request to a friend concerning this book, recorded in one of his letters: «Ключъ разумѣнія въ Ярославли же denискалъ, но неполныи ибо два суть выхода Ключовъ тѣхъ: первый Печерской печати, тои непольныи, а другій Львовской печати болѣе Печерскаго. Аще бы лучилось чесности твоей у кого обрѣсти Ключъ Львовскаго выхода, молю на малое время мнѣ прислать: нуждица менѣ въ немъ нѣчто пріискать.»

The fact that Dymytrii's rhetoric follows a neo-Latin, humanist model is beyond doubt. Michael Berndt's doctoral thesis, published in 1975, placed Dymytrii's homiletic works within the context of Early Modern rhetorical theory.[44] The humanist sources and models of Dymytrii's *Reading Menaea* have been thoroughly examined by A. Derzhavin, who demonstrated that Dymytrii used Western Latin hagiographic works as his primary sources and models.[45] Regarding Dymytrii's historiographic sources, valuable research has been done by Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, who has pointed out the richness of Dymytrii's *Chronicle* in regard to the author's sources and his strong sense of rhetorical structure.[46] The rich and diverse research projects of Berndt, Derzhavin and Brogi Bercoff have succeeded in directing scholarly attention to Dymytrii's actual texts and to the examination of these works within the context of a Baroque literary system based on the sciences of philology, grammar and rhetoric. Their work represents a positive step away from the biographic approach of nineteenth and early twentieth-century Russian scholars, who invariably regarded the author's "heavily decorated" Baroque style with distaste.

The efforts of these recent scholars—particularly Giovanna Brogi Bercoff—have laid the groundwork for this present dissertation by their rigorous examination of the fundamental philological and rhetorical system that serves as the basis for Dymytrii's way of thinking and his way of writing. The purpose of this thesis, however, is to explore Dymytrii's rhetoric on a more abstract level and find out what lies beneath the outward philological structures of Dymytrii's writing. My reason for doing so is that the Metropolitan of Rostov was first and foremost a pastor: his skill as a rhetorician was simply a tool that he employed for the more important task of saving souls. In this regard he followed Augustine's belief that in regard to Cicero's *docere, delectare, movere* triad, the Christian orator must concern himself most of all with the didactic purpose of his speech.[47] Therefore, this dissertation attempts to examine the abstract theological and philosophical truths that lie encoded within Dymytrii's rhetorical system.

---

[43] See Nikolai Petrov, "Iz istorii gomiletiki v staroi Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii," *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* (1886) 1: 92.

[44] Michael Berndt *Die Predigt Dimitrij Tuptalos: Studien zur ukrainischen und russischen Barockpredigt* (Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1975).

[45] See A. Derzhavin, "Chetii Minei sviatitelia Dimitriia, Mitropolita Rostovskogo kak tserkovnoistoricheskii i literaturnyi pamiatnik" in *Bogoslovskie trudy* 15: 63–145; 16: 46–141 (cited in Brogi Bercoff 361).

[46] Brogi Bercoff 293–364.

In researching this project, the question that I wished to address was that of Dymytrii's primary concern as a pastor and the larger, philosophical and theological concerns that moved him to write. His use of Ciceronian devices was indeed conscious and deliberate but it were not of paramount interest to him either as a writer or as a cleric. A humanist, he understood writing as a sacred task, undertaken for the glory of God and the salvation of the human being. A pastor of souls—in Slavonic, *dushpastyr*—Dymytrii's primary concern was the invisible world of the soul. The human soul—its interior structure, its interaction with the world that surrounds it, its relationship to the human body, its desire and love for God—was the dominant subject of every text that Dymytrii wrote.

It is for this reason that Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* has been chosen as the subject for this dissertation. A concise work, the *Alphabet* articulates Dymytrii's holistic approach to spiritual wisdom and understanding. What is more, the *Spiritual Alphabet* demonstrates an application of rhetorical principles to a higher purpose, that of bringing order and understanding to the human soul. It serves as a bridge between two worlds: the well-ordered and highly disciplined world of the rhetorician on the one hand, and the mysterious, paradoxical world of the human soul on the other. Hence, it provides scholars with an encompassing window to the author's way of thinking and perceiving the world around him. The principles outlined in the *Alphabet* serve as a key to understanding Dymytrii's literary corpus as a complete entity.

---

[47] Augustine, "On Christian Doctrine," trans. Marcus Dods, *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) ser. 1, 2: 583.

The authorship of the *Spiritual Alphabet* has been the subject of controversy since the late nineteenth century. Both Mikhail Stroev and Filaret Gumilevsky cited several manuscripts that belonged to Dymytrii, upon which was written the notation "The Spiritual Ladder of Godly Living, written by father Isaia Kopytensky after he was Metropolitan."[48] On the basis of this notation several scholars assigned authorship of the *Spiritual Alphabet* to Isaia Kopynsky (d. 1640), Metropolitan of Kyiv briefly in 1631.[49] Although the first publication of the *Alphabet* occurred one year after Dymytrii's death and was clearly based on the Metropolitan of Rostov's own copy of the text,[50] Stroev and

---

[48] «Лѣствица духовнаго по Бозѣ жительдства написана отцемъ Исаіею Копытенскимъ, послѣди бывшемъ митрополитомъ.» See: Mikhail Stroev, *Bibliologicheskii slovar' i chernovye k nemu materialy P. M. Stroeva*, ed. A. Bychkov (St. Petersburg, 1882) 120; Filaret Gumilevskii, *Obzor russkoi dukhovnoi literatury. Kniga pervaia i vtoraia 862–1863* (St. Petersburg, 1884)183.

[49] In addition to Stroev and Gumilevsky, other scholars discounting Dymytrii's authorship on this basis included Mykhailo Vozniak (Vozniak, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury* [L'viv: Prosvita, 1921] 2: 177) and Illia Shliapkin (quoted in Feodor Titov, "K istorii Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii v XVII–XVIII vv. II. Sviatyi Dimitrii, mitropolit Rostovskii, byvshei uchenik Akademii [1651–1709]," *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi adademii* [1909] 10: 216).

[50] The *Spiritual Alphabet* was first published in 1710 (Makhnovets' 1: 373; Ohienko, *Sviatyi Dymytrii Tuptalo* 169). In addition to being republished on its own throughout the eighteenth century, it was also included in book one of the four volume collected works of Dymytrii, entitled *Sochineniia sviatitelia Dimitriia, mitropolita Rostovskgo v 4-kh chastiakh* (Moscow , 1817-18). This four-volume collected works was republished a number of times in the nineteenth century (Moscow, 1842; Kyiv, 1880-81). A fifth volume was added to the 1842 and 1880–81 editions.

According to Makhnovets, the only works published by Dymytrii in Ukraine during his lifetime were his *Bedewed Fleece* (*Runo oroshennoe*), his *Apologia* , and his *Reading Menaea.* Andrei Titov, based on his study of surviving manuscripts, concluded that with the exception of the eight Ukrainian sermons edited by Titov, the majority of Dymytrii's surviving homiletic works acquired their present form late in the author's lifetime. (See Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* i–ii.) From the year 1684 onward Dymytrii's greatest energies were directed to his

Gumilevsky maintained that Dymytrii was only the translator of Kopynsky's work into Church Slavonic, and not the author.

Other scholars, however, maintained that the manuscript notation above referred to a different text entirely and not the *Spiritual Alphabet*. Ivan Ohienko (Metropolitan Ilarion) insisted that these were two different works, the *Spiritual Alphabet* by Dymytrii of Rostov and a separate work, entitled the *Spiritual Ladder*, by Kopynsky.[51] Ohienko insisted that the attribution to Kopynsky was clearly a mistake, and that the religious philosophy expressed in the *Alphabet* could have come only from the hand of Dymytrii. Ohienko was not the first to point out that these were two different works: as early as 1827 Evgenii Bolkhovitnikov was aware that these two different texts had existed at some point, and he ascribed authorship of the *Spiritual Alphabet* to Dymytrii of Rostov, and the *Spiritual Ladder* to Isaia Kopynsky.[52]

I support the position that Dymytrii was indeed the author of the *Spiritual Alphabet*. Far more evidence exists in favor of Dymytrii's authorship than Kopynsky's. The only copy of the *Alphabet* ever published was from Dymytrii's own manuscript. At the very least he was closely connected to this text—if not the actual author, then the man who produced the text in the form that we know it today. To date no one has provided concrete evidence that the *Alphabet* was produced by Isaia Kopynsky—no manuscript of the text from the hand of Kopynsky has ever appeared, and there is nothing other than the above-mentioned notation to connect Kopynsky to this work.[53]

Reading Menaea, completed only in 1705. It is understandable that he had little time to work on anything else during this twenty-one-year period.

[51] Ohienko, *Sviatyi Dymytrii Tuptalo* 169.

[52] Evgenii Bolkhovitnikov, *Slovar' o russkikh pisateliakh greko-rossiiskoi tserkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1827)1: 25, 212.

[53] Makhnovets lists the *Spiritual Alphabet*'s eighteenth-century publication history under his entry for Isaia Kopynsky, but indicates that the work has only been atttibuted to Kopynsky (Makhnovets' 1: 374). However, elsewhere in the same book Makhnovets includes the

The conclusive evidence that the *Spiritual Alphabet* was not produced by Kopynsky is, of course, the text itself. As mentioned above, Ohienko underlined this work's sophisticated religious philosophy—something for which Kopynsky was certainly not known. Kopynsky's authorship has only been assigned to one other text: an anti-Catholic polemic entitled *Apoleia Apologii*. This text is short—only 3 plus 9 folios—and it is essentially a brochure describing the Church Council of Kyiv in 1628, which denounced the formerly Orthodox zealot turned Uniate Archbishop Meletii Smotrytsky and his *Apologiia*.[54] To ascribe authorship of the *Alphabet* (over 200 folios in length) to Kopynsky, whose only proven work was a small brochure against Catholics—would assign a major literary work to a very minor author.

This question of literary context raises further doubts concerning Kopynsky's attributed authorship. The clerical culture in which Kopynsky lived and wrote was primarily concerned with polemical issues revolving around Orthodox and Catholic struggles for religious domination in Ukraine and Belarus.[55] The *Spiritual Alphabet* 's emphasis on interior life, inward reflection, and mystical prayer is hardly congruent with the stormy, confrontational religious turmoil of Kyiv in the 1630s. If it had been written during that unsettled period it would have indeed been an extraordinary work of religious introspection and inward piety. Thus the text itself suggests that it must have been written at a much later date.

In addition to Ohienko, other early twentieth-century scholars have also supported Dymytrii's authorship of the *Alphabet* on the basis of textual

---

Alphabet's nineteenth-century publication under his entry for Dymytrii of Rostov, i.e. in volume one of the *Sochineniia* (Makhnovets' 1: 574).

[54] Makhnovets' 1: 377.

[55] See the essay entitled "Religious Polemical Literature in the Ukrainian and Belarus' Lands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" in Ihor Ševčenko, *Ukraine Between East and West* (Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies P, 1996) 149–163.

evidence. In 1909 Mikhail Popov pointed out that the author of the *Alphabet* was extremely well-read in patristics, particularly the spiritual works of St. Gregory of Nyssa.[56] Again, this textual evidence is against Isaia Kopynsky's authorship and in favor of Dymytrii's. In 1910 Nikolai Vasilenko included the *Alphabet* among Dymytrii's works and commented both its profound religious philosophy and the extraordinary beauty and strength of its language—clearly suggesting that the author must have been someone of Dymytrii's literary stature.[57]

Additionally, when placed within the context of Dymytrii's other works, the *Spiritual Alphabet* seems to fit within his world-view, his religious philosophy and his way of writing. Although Shliapkin discounted Dymytrii's authorship of the *Alphabet,* he did not deny Dymytrii's authorship of another treatise, "The inner man in the chamber of his heart in solitude learns and prays in secret," a work that in terms of structure and theme clearly reflects the *Spiritual Alphabet.*[58] Throughout this dissertation examples from Dymytrii's other works will be cited to demonstrate the complex and complementary interrelationship between the *Alphabet* and Dymytrii's other writings. Whether Dymytrii was the author of this text or whether he was its translator, it is impossible to deny that the ideas and rhetorical principles of *Spiritual Alphabet* fit comfortably within the context of Dymytrii's literary corpus as a whole.

On the other hand, when we place the *Spiritual Alphabet* within the context of East Slavic spiritual writing, we are immediately struck by the uncommon, perhaps unique, position that this text occupies within Slavic Orthodox religious literary culture. Seventeenth-century East Slavic literature is dominated by the clerical culture that produced it. Polemical works are abundantly represented: Belarusian and Ukrainian Orthodox against Roman Catholic and Uniate at the beginning of the century; Russian Orthodox against Old Ritualist at the end and at the beginning of the eighteenth. Sermons, Saints' Lives, and historical chronicles that served a similar didactic, religious purpose are also represented in the literary culture of the period.[59] Dymytrii worked in all these prose genres, and, like his contemporaries, he also produced a sizeable number of religious dramas and poetic works, especially devotional poems. But the *Spiritual Alphabet* stands alone in Dymytrii's literary corpus as a religious philosophical text bearing a highly organized rhetorical structure incorporating poetic verse within a predominantly prose, didactic narrative. At times the *Alphabet* clearly resembles a sermon, while at other times it bears the features of a devotional poem that borrows formal elements from the Orthodox liturgy. Therefore, when we study Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* we must keep in mind that this text is a truly unusual literary work.

---

[56] Mikhail Popov, *Sviatitel' Dimitrii Rostovskii i ego trudy* (St. Petersburg, 1910) 301.

[57] Nikolai Vasilenko, "Zasedanie 8-go noiabria 1909. Svedeniia o zasedaniiakh Istoricheskago obshchestva Nestora Letopistsa s 27-go oktiabria 1909 g. do 2y-e oktiabria 1910 g. (Doklad na temu Dimitrii Rostovskii i ego literaturnaia deiatel'nost')" *Chteniia v Istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa* 22 (1911) no. 3: 81.

[58] «Внутренній человѣкъ въ клѣти сердца своего уединенъ поучающся и молящися втайнѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 144–55. See chapter five of this thesis, "*Pronunciatio spiritualis.*"

Without further research it is difficult to determine whether any other author of the period wrote, or was even capable of writing, a text similar to Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet*. The closest contemporary relative may be perhaps the ascetical treatises of Havrylo Dometsky, archimandrite of the Chudov Monastery in Moscow circa 1690. Dometsky's treatises, such as his *Road to Eternity* (*Put' k" vechnosti*), remain little-known, if not obscure, works.[60] To find a philosophical treatise comparable to the *Spiritual Alphabet* it is necessary to look several generations ahead to the time of Hryhoryii Skovoroda (1722–94), the foremost religious thinker of eighteenth-century Ukraine. Skovoroda's *Primary Door to Christian Virtue* (*Nachal'naia dver' ko khrystiianskomu dobronraviiu*) shares a common spirit with the *Alphabet*'s philological and philosophical approach to the acquisition of interior wisdom. Although Skovoroda's *Primary Door* is written in the form of dialogues and the *Alphabet* is not, it shares the *Alphabet*'s humanist concern with interior piety "and proclaims the supremacy of faith and interior piety over laws and external ritual."[61] These two texts also share a conviction that pious behavior can be imparted to the spiritual disciple in a systematic and orderly fashion. Doubtless Skovoroda was well-acquainted with the *Spiritual Alphabet*, a text that had been published and republished exactly twelve times in the decades leading up to Skovoroda's death in 1794. Skovoroda even entitled one of his colloquies, *A Conversation Called "The Alphabet or The Primer of the World'* (*Razhovor, nazyvaemyi Alfavit yly Bukvar' myra,* 1775) and based it on the theme "Know Thyself," a central idea in Dymytrii's own *Alphabet.* Thus, the *Spiritual Alphabet* is situated on a literary and philosophical continuum beginning with the first publication of this remarkable text only one year after Dymytrii's death, and continuing into the life and work of Hryhorii Skovoroda.

---

[59] DmitrijTschizewskij remains the foremost authority on the history of East Slavic literature during the Medieval and Early Modern periods. See: DmitrijTschizewskij, *A History of Ukrainian Literature from the 11th to the 19th Century*, trans. Dolly Ferguson (Littleton: Ukrainian Acad. P, 1975); Dmitrij Tschizewskij, *A History of Russian Literature from the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque* ('s-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1960).

As a devotional text, the *Spiritual Alphabet* shares a common spirit with the *devotio moderna* practised by the Renaissance humanists and other early modern religious thinkers, including the Jesuits. Such well-known texts as the

---

[60] Nothing was published in connection with Dometsky's works until well into the nineteenth century (Makhnovets' 305–6). Dmitrij Tschizewskij, despite his enthusiasm for East Slavic Baroque literature, showed little interest in Dometsky's treatises, even commenting that "their content is traditionally ascetic and therefore of little interest" [!] (DmitrijTschizewskij, *A History of Ukrainian Literature* 351) .

[61] Natalia Pylypiuk, "The Primary Door: At the Threshold of Skovoroda's Theology and Poetics" in *Adelphotes*, a special issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14 (1990): 563.

Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola and the *Imitatio Christi* of Thomas a Kempis are based on a common focus on the Incarnation and a concern for good deeds and kindness toward others as an expression of interior piety.[62] Book Two of Kempis' *Imitatio Christi*, "Concerning the Interior Life," is especially noteworthy: Dymytrii's *Alphabet* shares Kempis' belief that the Christian must at all times attend to the inward disposition of his soul, demonstrating his love for Christ through good works and the fullness of his interior prayer life.

The extraordinary position that Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* occupies in late seventeenth-century East Slavic literature is especially puzzling given that we know nothing about the circumstances in which the author produced this work. In its present form it likely dates from the period of his tenure as Metropolitan of Rostov (1702–9). It is derived, however, from his lifetime of work as a pastor and preacher, and based above all else on his direct personal experience in caring for the spiritual needs of others. Despite Bolkhovitnikov's belief that the *Spiritual Alphabet* was written early in Dymytrii's lifetime, while he was still living in Ukraine,[63] I suggest that this text was probably written later. The alphabet letters used in published editions of the *Spiritual Alphabet* suggest a Russian rather than Ukrainian pronunciation of Church Slavonic.[64] This may have been Dymytrii's own adaptation to the local Rostovite pronunciation, but without a close examination of extant faithful manuscripts of the *Alphabet* this conclusion would be difficult to prove conclusively. After 1693 all printed works published in Ukraine and Russia conformed to "normalized"

---

[62] By far the largest study of the *devotio moderna* is R. R. Post, *The Modern Devotion: Confrontation with Reformation and Humanism* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968) (= *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman). See also: Albert Hyma, *The Christian Renaissance: A History of the Devotio Moderna* (New York: Century,1965); William C. Creasy, *The Imitation of Christ by Thomas à Kempis: A New Reading* (Macon: Mercer UP, 1989).

[63] Evgenii Bolkhovitnikov, *Slovar' o russkikh pisateliakh greko-rossiiskoi tserkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1827)1: 25.

[64] See appendix .

Russian Church Slavonic. Therefore, the Russian Church Slavonic features of the *Alphabet*'s printed editions may be attributed to this work's editors rather than Dymytrii himself. Even if we did have a manuscript copy of the *Spiritual Alphabet* written by Dymytrii himself or copied under his supervision this might still not clearly establish this work's geographic provenance. Throughout his entire life Dymytrii probably wrote Church Slavonic with Ukrainian characteristics and any printed versions of his texts invariably required editorial corrections to conform to Russian rules. Thus, it would be difficult to date the *Alphabet* on the basis of language alone.

On the other hand, if we consider cultural factors, it is indeed appears likely that the *Alphabet* was written during Dymytrii's Rostov period. The text reflects the author's concern over outward, formalistic ritualism, a concern more likely connected to the religious controversies that Dymytrii encountered later in life in Moscow and Rostov. Although the *Alphabet* was not published until the year after his death, the basic principles outlined in the *Alphabet* appear and reappear throughout Dymytrii's writings, including his sermons, Saints' Lives and various devotional works.

Thus, the ideas presented in the *Alphabet* result from the author's lifelong study of spiritual wisdom and the need to impart this wisdom to Christian believers. The concepts found in Dymytrii's text can be recognized elsewhere in his other works, particularly his sermons and his saints' lives. This dissertation will select and examine a number of Dymytrii's other works—many of them written much earlier than the *Alphabet*—and place them within the context of the *Alphabet* 's rhetorical program. These selections will include various sermons for Sundays and feast-days, the *Reading Menaea*, the *Nativity Drama*, and Dymytrii's treatise on prayer, entitled "The inner man in the chamber of his heart in solitude learns and prays in secret." These texts will demonstrate that the idea of spiritual wisdom as a rhetorical sequence is central to all of Dymytrii's writings, including the *Alphabet*.

Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* represents something of a mystery as to its purpose and its intended audience. The book's references to Aristotle, Cicero, Plato presume an educated audience, as does the highly rhetorical structure of the text. On a linguistic basis it appears that the *Alphabet* was written for a Russian rather than a Ukrainian readership.[65] The subject-matter of the *Alphabet*, however, is universal. The main idea is wisdom and how it is to be acquired. In connection with this goal several questions must be answered: What are the sources of wisdom? What is the means by which it is imparted? What are the various kinds of wisdom? How does the Christian discern between false wisdom and truth? How does he ensure that once acquired, wisdom is not lost? What are the ethical implications of wisdom? What are the cosmological implications of wisdom? What is the human being's proper response to Divine Wisdom?

Dymytrii's *Alphabet* speaks to people who pursue wisdom and knowledge, and yet find themselves dissatisfied with what they find. The most sincere attempts to acquire understanding are invariably met with confusion, he writes, for when man approaches the kingdom of true wisdom he finds himself unable to understand that which he sees before him. Dymytrii's task is to teach his readers a special alphabet that will enable them to decipher indecipherable mysteries before them, and to comprehend the incomprehensible world that surrounds them. Dymytrii's alphabet—his *Spiritual Alphabet*—provides the necessary characters and the required sequence and order to accomplish these goals.

---

[65] See appendix.

Dymytrii's Alphabet for Inward Wisdom: the *Spiritual Alphabet*

The basic idea behind Dymytrii's *Alphabet* is one that has concerned philosophers since ancient times: how to educate the human being in pious living. The concept of Christian *paideia* was not new at the time of Dymytrii. What was new, however, was the belief that the goal of spiritual wisdom could be achieved through a systematic approach. Champions of a new systematic approach included Erasmus and Ignatius Loyola, who proposed an orderly and sequential program for the education of children in the liberal arts. The four-fold goals of this new approach to education were:

1. Material—after completing the sequence the student should be able to earn his own living;
2. Social—the student should be ready to participate in civic life;
3. Cultural—the student should appreciate the fine arts, for such refinement distinguishes human beings from animals;
4. Spiritual—the student's mind should be directed toward heaven.

Loyola revolutionized education by ordering the child's scholarly career as a sequence of steps. His program was highly structured, in this respect differing from the freer approach of medieval learning. Loyola transformed the scholastic trivium-quadrivium from a medieval grouping of subjects to a modern sequential structure in which the student begins at the primary level and then advances to higher levels in an orderly and systematic fashion. His sequential approach transformed Western education and continues to be the basic structure by which school programs are organized to this day.[66]

---

[66] See Ignatius of Loyola, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, trans. George Ganss (St. Louis, 1970) 190–98. Book 2, document 3, part 4, chapter 6, entitled "The Means by which scholastics will progress toward learning the aforementioned branches [i.e. the humane letters of grammar and rhetoric] well" outlines Loyola's basic educational principles, particularly his emphasis on order and sequence.

The *Spiritual Alphabet* follows a comparable systematic, modern approach to learning. Above all else, Dymytrii argues that there must be order and sequence in the education of the Christian soul. The pedagogical principles that form the basis of Dymytrii's *Alphabet* and the application of these principles in the author's lifetime represent the first attempt at creating a early modern and systemic approach to Christian *paideia* among the Orthodox Slavs.

When talking about the soul and its well-being, Dymytrii presents a program for Christian living that is based primarily on scriptures and the Church Fathers. The organization of this program, however, shares much with humanist pedagogical practices common to post-Renaissance Europe. For Dymytrii, the soul possesses its own alphabet, vocabulary, grammar, poetics and rhetoric. As students are taught grammar and rhetoric in school, so also should the human being be trained in the art of understanding the soul. Just as textbooks are utilized in the learning of grammar, a hand-book is likewise beneficial for the acquisition of spiritual understanding. Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* is such an instruction book.

Dymytrii's *Alphabet* is first and foremost a book about Christian *paideia*: the forming of a student's outlook that is conducive to Christian living. It involves the desired goal, not of spiritual perfection—for such a desire is vanity—but rather, the tempering of the unruly spirit. Harmony, balance, moderation, clarity, concord—the guiding principles of grammar and rhetoric—are the standards by which Christians are to measure spiritual life. The idea of Christian *paideia* is not new, for the idea of nurturing the human soul in the practice of virtuous living is as old as the Church Fathers, who themselves borrowed the ideal of pious education from Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics. What clearly identifies Dymytrii as an early modern Christian pedagogue, however, is the fact that his approach to

Christian *paideia* is a systematic one: pious living is to be learned by advancing through a sequence of exercises and steps in an orderly fashion.

Dymytrii conceives his idea of Christian *paideia* within the context of two intellectual traditions: medieval Slavic Orthodoxy, and Renaissance humanism. As with any other Orthodox cleric, his primary sources were liturgical texts, the Bible, and the Church Fathers. As with any other Kyivan-educated cleric of his generation, his secondary sources included a rich cornucopia of Western European cultural property. Included in this category were the Protestant and Catholic German history books, the Jesuit scriptural commentaries and hagiographic works, and the substantial collection of philological texts that formed the corpus of Dymytrii's personal library.

Regarding inner devotion and the imitation of Christ, the devotional life advocated by Erasmus rested upon an important distinction between inner piety and external devotion. The Catholic approach to pious living affirmed the efficacy of the sacraments, the performance of good deeds, indulgences and external devotions. Erasmus, without denying the efficacy of external devotions, exhorted his students to pursue a life of inner piety within the sacramental life of the Church: "Corporal works should not be condemned, but those that are invisible are preferred. Visible worship is not condemned, but God is appeased only by invisible piety."[67] The two fundamental ideas upon which Erasmus built his program for devotional life were: (1) the role of scripture in inspiring inner piety and (2) the imitation of Christ as a model for Christian living. In this respect Erasmus owed much to Thomas à Kempis and the *devotio moderna* of the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance.[68] As Mary Giles has demonstrated,

---

[67] From Erasmus's *The Handbook of the Christian Soldier*, quoted in Léon-E. Halkin, *Erasmus: A Critical Biography*, trans. John Tonkin (Oxford: Blackwell P, 1993) 57.

[68] For a wider perspective on *devotio moderna* and European Christian culture during the Early Modern period see Léon-E. Halkin's essay "La *Devotio moderna* " in Klaniczay, *L'époque de la Renaissance 1400–1600* 1: 261–268.

Erasmus inspired a summons to inner spirituality that was to dominate the devotional life of early modern Europe.[69]

The *Spiritual alphabet* makes this same crucial distinction between outward piety and inward spiritual life. Like Erasmus, Dymytrii himself was stepping on controversial ground when he advocated a prayer life based on inward stillness and reflection. The religious controversies in which Dymytrii found himself embroiled centered above all else on external rituals, placing the formalistic aspect of Orthodox liturgy at the forefront of religious life. His participation in the 1689 controversy in Moscow over the practice of kneeling during the liturgy and his ongoing struggle against the Old Ritualists during his tenure as Metropolitan of Rostov were controversies that in reality had nothing to do with dogma and everything to do with ritual forms, and reflected the Muscovite Church's preoccupation with the most minute details of liturgical gestures. Indeed, in his treatise on prayer entitled "The inner man in the chamber of his heart in solitude learns and prays in secret" he finds it necessary to defend the practice of private devotional prayer against those who argue that the only acceptable prayers are those that are prescribed in liturgical books.[70]

The tendency to equate piety with external forms, of course, is common to many religions, not just Christianity. Even within Dymytrii's own experience there was a marked difference between the less formalistic religious culture of

---

[69] The inner piety of Erasmus borrowed much from late medieval spirituality, particularly the prayer of recollection (as practised by the traditional Franciscans), the prayer of abandon (characteristic of quietism), and the conviction that the divine spark within is the most reliable guide in divine love (a conviction held by the Spanish *alumbrados*). Against the background of the Protestant Reformation, and later the Catholic Counter-Reformation, the emphasis on inner devotion that Erasmus advocated was viewed with suspicion by the Catholic Church. In the years that followed, the Inquisition feared that an emphasis on inner piety would promote quietism and individualism at the expense of church authority. Hence, followers of the *devotio moderna*, including Teresa of Avila and Juan de la Cruz, were suspect in the eyes of the Inquisition. See Mary Giles 6ff.

[70] «Внутренній человѣкъ въ клѣти сердца своего уединенъ поучающся и молящися втайнѣ»—cf. chapter five of this thesis, "*Pronunciatio spiritualis.*"

Kyiv and the very rigid formalism of Moscow's conservative clergy.[71] Dymytrii was born into a society where urban life reflected the rich diversity of its two dominant cultures, Ukrainian Orthodox and Polish Catholic. In contrast the last years of his life were spent in the less tolerant—even xenophobic—religious culture of Muscovy. Against an ecclesiastical background that equated external rituals with true Christian faith, Dymytrii's emphasis on inner devotion, pious living and acts of charity, placed him at odds with the dominant Orthodox religious culture of Moscow and Rostov.

Despite being surrounded by a formalistic religious culture that placed great emphasis on what Christian rituals were supposed to look like, in his *Spiritual Alphabet* Dymytrii advocated a program that gave equal, perhaps greater, emphasis to the inner world of the spirit and to the social responsibilities requisite to Christian living. The result is a humanist and modern approach to the practice of the Orthodox faith based on (1) an adherence to the doctrines of the One Universal Church and the fullness of its liturgical life, and (2) inner devotion and a life lived in imitation of Christ. These concepts were drawn from an intellectual culture that drew essential elements from the common spiritual soil of post-Renaissance Christian Europe. For Dymytrii, the education of the inward Christian was to be based primarily on the Bible and the Church Fathers. This education presupposed adherence to Orthodox doctrine, participation in the sacraments of the Eastern Church, obligatory participation in this church's liturgical life, and individual prayer and devotional life on a voluntary basis. The structure of Dymytrii's program—its arrangement or disposition—however, shared much in common with the ideas of Erasmus, Loyola, and the seventeenth-century Czech pedagogue and theologian John Comenius (Jan Amos Komensky). For Dymytrii, Orthodox Christian living is a humanist endeavor based on philology, the study of scriptures and patristics and a systematic approach to knowledge acquisition.

---

[71] This is the subject of my forthcoming article, "East and West in the Theology of Dymytrij Tuptalo" in *The Influence of Orthodoxy and Western Christianity on Society: A Comparative Approach* (Paris: Maison des Sciences d'Homme, forthcoming).

Above all else it must be emphasized that Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* is a rhetorical progamme deeply rooted in the Orthodox Church—its liturgical services, its sacraments, its life of mystical prayer, and above all else its doctrinal teachings derived from the Greek patristic tradition of scriptural exegesis. The most striking example of this is Dymytrii's discussion of human nature, in particular his understanding of Adam's first sin. Despite being well-read in Counter-Reformation theology, Dymytrii emphatically rejects the Roman Catholic doctrine of original sin. The Catholic Church, especially after the Council of Trent (1545–63), assigned joint guilt to all human beings for the sin of Adam, affirming that human nature bears the culpability of Adam's transgression.[72] The Catholic doctrine of original sin was formulated on the basis of the Latin translation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans concerning the transgression of Adam "in whom all men have sinned (*in quo omnes peccaverunt*)" (Rom. 5.12). The Council of Trent proclaimed that the "disease of original sin" is transmitted though procreation and is proper to each human person. Even after baptism there still remains a "concupiscence" or a sickness of human nature. In accordance with the teachings of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas the formal element of sin is removed by baptism while the material element (i.e. the corrupt human nature) remains.

Orthodox theologians disagreed, insisting that the Latin text "in quo omnes peccaverunt" mistranslated the original Greek "eph ho pantes hemarton."[73] Byzantine theologians argued that the Latin translation was gammatically impossible according to the Greek original, and instead interpreted St. Paul's words to mean that "because of *death* all men have sinned." Consequently, the Greek patristic tradition identified the inheritance of the first sin as an inheritance of mortality rather than sinfulness, as sinfulness is merely the consequence of mortality. As John Meyendorff explains:

---

[72] See the canons of the council's decree on original sin in Hubert Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, trans. Ernest Graf (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961) 150–51.

> The Eastern Fathers who read St. Paul in the original Greek never attempted to prove the *joint guilt* of all the descendants of Adam for the sin of their ancestor: they merely observed that all men have inherited corruption and death by a process of inheritance and that all have committed sins. They preferred to interpret the state of affairs inherited from Adam as a slavery to the Devil, who exercises a usurped, unjust, and deadly tyranny over mankind since the sin of man's Progenitor.[74]

This approach to Adam's sin has wide theological implications. The sacrament of baptism—particularly infant baptism—demonstrates this clearly. Unlike the Christian West, which approaches this sacrament within the context of inherited guilt and forgiveness, Orthodox sacramental theology regards baptism as the liberation from death and the gift of new and immortal life. Mortal parents are unable to give eternal life themselves, having inherited death from Adam. It is for this reason that infant baptism in the Orthodox Church is performed as an initiation into the life eternal only: infants and young children are not—and cannot—be baptized for the remission of sins, for their sins are non-existent.[75]

Dymytrii adheres to the teaching of the Greek Fathers that the ancestral sin of Adam, like all transgressions, was an act of personal will and not of nature; hence, inherited guilt is impossible. This belief has profound implications for the *Spiritual Alphabet* 's discussion of human nature and the role accorded to personal will in Dymytrii's Christian ethics. Throughout the *Alphabet* Dymytrii affirms the natural goodness of human beings and this natural inclination to virtuous living. Sin is a consequence of mortality and like mortality it is not natural, for it is the unnatural result of willful disobedience. Christian ethics becomes, therefore, a matter of restoring the human being's natural inclination to goodness and virtue.

---

[73] The two best-known defenders of the Orthodox position were Saints Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret. See John Meyendorff, "*Eph ho* chez Cyrille d'Alexandre et Theodoret" in *Studia Patristica* 79 (1961): 157–61. On the opposite side of this debate stood the Latin Father Jerome. See Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968) 2: 307–8.

[74] John Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and Its Role in the World Today,* trans. John Chapin (New York: Pantheon, 1962)1948–99. See also Meyendorff's *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham UP, 1974)143–46.

[75] Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology* 145.

Theologically, Dymytrii represents an attempt by certain seventeenth-century East Slavic intellectuals to embrace the fullness of European intellectual life while at the same time remaining faithful to Orthodox doctrine. Among his contemporaries we see an intellectual continuum represented, at one end, by Grecophile traditionalists such as Patriarch Ioakim and Evfimii Chudovsky, and at the other end, by Orthodox Westernizers such as Silvestr Medvedev, Symeon Polotsky and Lazar Baranovych. In the middle of this continuum we find such men as Dymytrii and his friend Stefan Iavorsky. Whereas Medvedev and Polotsky embraced Western interpretations of such doctrines as purgatory, original sin, and the immaculate conception, Dymytrii carefully stepped around these dogmas, always vigilant that his teachings accord with Orthodox doctrine. It would be wrong to say that Dymytrii's theology was completely free from Western influences: latinate tendencies did occasionally creep into his theology, particularly during his younger years. We need only look at the 1689 edition of the *Reading Menaea*, volume one, with its inclusion of Augustine and Jerome among the Orthodox saints, as evidence of this. Even in Dymytrii's other works we detect passages in which he appears suspiciously close to Roman Catholic teachings on purgatory and the immaculate conception.[76] At the same time, however, he never fully stepped into a latinate theological interpretation as did Medvedev, Polotsky and Baranovych. Although well-versed in Western theology, Dymytrii was careful never to completely break with Orthodox doctrine.

Thus Dymytrii sincerely attempted—and, what is more, successfully achieved—a harmonious reconciliation between his Orthodox faith with the latest intellectual currents of his time. The uniqueness of Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* lies in the author's faithful adherence to Orthodox dogma while at the same time using the most modern philological and pedagogical models available to him. The orderly sequence that Dymytrii advocates for spiritual learning shares much in common with the revolutionary developments in the field of education proposed by Loyola and Erasmus. Dymytrii's *Alphabet* organizes the inward learning of the soul as an orderly and progressive sequence. Beginning students must not be overwhelmed with tasks that are too difficult. Following the completion of simple tasks, students of inward learning are given more challenging tasks to master as they proceed to a higher level. It is the inter-relatedness of Dymytrii's program that marks his *Alphabet* as a modern, pedagogically-based approach to spiritual understanding.

The *Spiritual alphabet* bears much in common with the pedagogical theory of Jan Comenius (Jan Amos Komensky, 1592–1670). Comenius's *Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart* (*Labirynt swěta a Ráj Srdce*, Amsterdam, 1631) relates the first-person narrative of a character identified as "The Pilgrim." The Pilgrim seeks to find wisdom in the world and does not find it, not even in the company of learned professors. At the end of the book, Jesus Christ appears and explains to the Pilgrim why his search for wisdom was fruitless among the learned:

---

[76] Dymytrii's teachings on these doctines is discussed in my forthcoming article, "East and West in the Theology of Dymytrij Tuptalo."

> Among the learned you have seen how they try to fathom all things; let the summit of all your learning be to search for me in my deeds to see how wonderfully I direct you as well as all else; here you will find more material for your consideration, and that with ineffable delight, than those scholars. Instead of all libraries, to read which is but endless toil and small profit, often harm, always weariness and sorrow, I give you this one book in which are deposited all the liberal arts. Here your grammar will consist in the contemplation of my words; your dialectics in the faith in them; your rhetoric in prayers and sighs; your natural sciences, in the examination of my works; your metaphysics in the delight in me and in things eternal; your mathematics, in the counting, weighing, and measuring of my blessings on the one hand, and of the ungratefulness of the world on the other; your ethics, in my love which is to be the rule of all your conduct both toward me and toward your neighbors. But seek in all these arts not to be seen of men, but rather to become closer to me. For the humbler you are, the more proficient in the arts you will become. For my light illumines none but the humble heart.[77]

Like Comenius, Dymytrii sees a correlation between the outward knowledge of the liberal arts and the inward knowledge of spiritual understanding. Comenius is a pedagogue, Dymytrii a rhetorician. As grammarians both men recognize that language is the principal means by which wisdom is imparted. If the understanding of the world is transmitted by means of language, so too does the understanding of the soul order itself according to philological principles drawn from the subjects of grammar and rhetoric. The one book of Comenius is the same one book of Dymytrii: the Bible. By taking the principles of language education and applying them to the interior study of God's revelation, the acquisition of spiritual wisdom may be facilitated and expedited.

Dymytrii's distinction between inward and outward wisdom, of course, reflects his understanding of the anatomy of the soul itself. Like all things, the human possesses an interior and an exterior, represented by its inward conscience and its outward understanding. Throughout Dymytrii's writing we see a neo-Platonic influence on his understanding of the human soul, particularly in regard to the soul's tripartite nature.[78] Like Marsilio Ficino, Dymytrii anatomizes the human soul into three parts corresponding to the charioteer and his two horses in Plato's *Phaedrus* dialogue: the charioteer represents the intellect, the worse horse is the vegetative power of the imagination together with human nature, and the better horse is the rational power.[79] According to Ficino and the Florentine humanists, the human soul operates according to three vehicles, each corresponding to one of the soul's three parts:

---

[77] Comenius, *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart*, trans. Matthew Spinka (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1972) 106.

1. The material and compound vehicle—life that dissolves when the body dissolves;
2. The material and simple vehicle—long-lasting life;
3. The immaterial and simple vehicle—immortal life.[80]

Hence, the corresponding three parts of the soul:

1. The vegetative soul (Greek *zoe*);
2. The animative, concupiscible or sensible soul (Greek *psyche*);
3. The reasoning soul (Greek *pneuma*).

---

[78] Cf. Plotinus: "We must not, therefore, posit more than three hypostases, nor make superfluous distinctions between intelligible realities which their nature will not admit. We must insist there is Intellect, unchangeably the same, not subject to decline, and to the best of its powers an image of the Father; and that as to our soul, one part is for ever in contact with the Intelligible, one part concerned with the world of sense, and a third part holds a mediate position"—*The Neoplatonists*, trans. John Gregory (London: Kyle Cathie, 1991) 77.

[79] Allen, Michael J., trans., *Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1981) 98.

[80] Allen, *Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer* 234.

The vegetative soul is that of the natural appetite which draws nourishment, and it is common to human beings, animals and plants.[81] The animative soul is that which possesses the faculty to know, the faculty to desire, and the faculty of action. Hence it is shared by human beings and animals, but not by plants. The reasoning soul is that which possesses the two principal powers of the understanding and the will. This third and highest soul is shared by human beings and angels.

The idea of a tripartite soul, of course, was not limited to Plato. Aristotle likewise accepted the doctrine of the three souls—vegetative, sensible and rational.[82] Another well-known preacher of the seventeenth-century, John Donne, underlined the Aristotelian point of view concerning this doctrine:

> The entire philosophy of Aristotle, prince of philosophers, shows the actions of the soul to be joined to those of the body, and those of the body to the soul, mingled and united: like wax imprinted on a seal, like sight in the eye's pupil, like matter and form, thus making one thing alone do body and soul combine to form man.[83]

Whether we consider the doctrine of the tripartite soul to be Arisotelian or neo-Platonic in origin, the important thing is that Dymytrii follows the premise that order and harmony among the soul's three elements are required in order for the human being to flourish. The basic idea at work in Dymytrii's *Alphabet* is that a Christian can master the art of harmonious spiritual living in the same way that a student learns the art of rhetoric. The methodology employed by Dymytrii borrows from this academic subject, and it adheres to the five-fold sequence of Classical rhetoric:

---

[81] See the chapter entitled, "Theories of Knowledge and Perception" in H. James Jensen's *The Muses Concord: Literature, Music, and the Visual Arts in the Baroque Age* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1976) 1–23.

[82] Rosalie Osmond, *Mutual Accusation: Seventeenth-Century Body and Soul Dialogues in Their Literary and Theological Context* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990) 121.

[83] Donald L. Guss, *John Donne, Petrarchist* (Detroit, 1966) 143. Cited in Rosalie Osmond, *Mutual Accusation* 245.

1. Inventio (Greek: *heuresis*);
2. Dispositio (*taxis*);
3. Elocutio (*lexis*);
4. Memoria (*mneme*);
5. Pronuntiatio (*ypokrisis*).

If we synthesize the constituent elements of Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* into a coherent system, we see that the author applies these rhetorical principles to the inward life of the soul, arranging his spiritual program according to the five components of rhetoric. For the soul to grow and flourish, attention must be given to the following:

1. The soul's invention—the sources from which the soul draws spiritual knowledge and understanding;
2. The soul's disposition—the manner in which the soul arranges itself;
3. The soul's elocution—the manner in which the soul and the body; work together to obey God's commandments and to perform good deeds;
4. The soul's memory—the mindfulness of God's benevolent love and of his final judgement;
5. The soul's pronunciation—prayer.

When examining the five-fold rhetorical system that endows the *Spiritual Alphabet* with its sequence and order, it is important to bear in mind that Dymytrii's pedagogy operates according to a complex coherent spiritual curriculum. The five components that constitute the soul's education do not form a linear progression (i.e. one following the next) but are arranged as concentric circles. Spiritual inventiveness may be the first subject and pronunciation the fifth; however, these two elements of the curriculum must be introduced to the learner simultaneously. As the learner acquires greater proficiency in each of the five subjects, he then proceeds to study them at a higher level. Here Dymytrii follows the same pedagogical structure as Comenius, who insisted that the same school subjects are to be taught at all age levels; hence, the program consists of concentric circles rather than linear progressions. As the student advances through the program, the circles of knowledge in each subject become larger.[84] In a similar way Dymytrii's program, although distinguishing between the five fields of spiritual learning, does not separate the five from one another, for they are complementary and interrelated elements of one coherent curriculum.

The first rhetorical component of Dymytrii's program is the soul's inventiveness—*inventio spiritualis*—discussed in chapter one of this thesis. In the *Spiritual Alphabet* pedagogical sequences are the means by which the interior human being is educated in the wisdom of the soul. Dymytrii's concept of spiritual inventiveness is deeply rooted in his Christian ethics, his neo-Platonic philosophy, and his humanist background in philology and rhetoric. *Inventio spiritualis* requires the study of all things with the all-encompassing knowledge and understanding of a Renaissance humanist. It is by means of such invention that the Christian brings order and harmonious arrangement to the interior world of his soul.

The second component of Dymytrii's program is the soul's arrangement—*dispositio spiritualis*—discussed in chapter two. An Orthodox pastor, Dymytrii believes in the natural goodness of human beings and their natural inclination for order and harmony. A neo-Platonist, Dymytrii also affirms that the inward arrangement of the human soul reflects the outward arrangement of the cosmos. Like grammar, the human being's happiness depends upon the agreement of all his component parts: his body, his interior soul, his exterior soul. When there is discord and dissent within the human being, disaster results. Misunderstanding, confusion, doubt, despair and finally sin and corruption afflict the human soul that is in a state of divisiveness and imbalance. The troubled soul can be healed only through reason and pious understanding. Once all things are clearly understood, then balance and harmony return to the interior human.

---

[84] See the chapter entitled "The Concept of Coherent Curriculum" in *Comenius*, trans. John Sadler (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1969) 75–81.

The third rhetorical component of Dymytrii's program is the soul's elocution—*elocutio spiritualis*—discussed in chapter three. Above all else the *Alphabet* 's program is to be undertaken within a social context. Spiritual elocution is the task of giving force to spiritual understanding through good deeds and acts of charity. Without deeds, wisdom is senseless and dumb. God has placed human beings in a social classroom where spiritual wisdom must be fully articulated through good works. It is the individual Christian's good works that constitute the power and eloquence that must accompany his spiritual inventiveness and good disposition.

The fourth rhetorical component of Dymytrii's program is the soul's memory—*memoria spiritualis*—discussed in chapter four. For Dymytrii the art of spiritual memory entails sensibility and good perception in the work of spiritual living. Man's sensibilities may easily lead him astray if he does not possess the requisite mindfulness that can temper his perceptions and allow him to discern between truth and falsehood. Spiritual mindfulness must be nurtured and allowed to flourish if the human being is to live his life in the fullness of wisdom and interior understanding. If he applies his senses to the task of spiritual perception, then *memoria spiritualis* will enable him to navigate through the sea of spiritual dangers and temptations that surrounds him.

The fifth and final component of Dymytrii's program is the soul's pronunciation—*pronunciatio spiritualis*—discussed in chapter five. This last component of the *Alphabet* 's rhetorical program consists of the human being's loving and hopeful dialogue with God through prayer. As in all things, Dymytrii believes that prayer has both an inward and an outward aspect. The outward aspect of prayer is liturgy, consisting of dutiful attendance at divine services and obligatory participation in communal worship. As Christians, however, the *Alphabet* 's readers are also called to interior prayer: a voluntary and individual devotion that takes place in the interior chamber of the human heart. Dymytrii's *pronunciatio spiritualis* is based on the rhetorical ideals of modesty, economy, and restraint in conjunction with attentiveness, zeal and love for the one who is being addressed. The good order and disposition of the interior self, the disciplining of the self through obedience to God's commandments through acts of love and kindness—all these things find fruition in the human being's *pronunciatio spiritualis* expressed through a pious, interior prayer life.

In the final analysis the *Spiritual Alphabet* 's program for spiritual wisdom—like all curriculums—is goal oriented. For the student of rhetoric the promised goal is eloquent speech and the ability to persuade. For the student of Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* the destination is spiritual and cosmological: he is to strive for inward harmony, a peaceful and meaningful dialogue with the world surrounding him, and, most of all, a loving and mutually responsive relationship with God. The *Alphabet* calls upon Christians to become rhetoricians of their souls, finding oneness with God and the universe by bringing order and good arrangement to their interior selves.

Chapter One: *Inventio Spiritualis*

Like other European intellectuals of his day, Dymytrii was the product of a humanist culture that accorded rhetoric a preeminent place in the intellectual development of young people.[85] As a preacher Dymytrii believed that of all the liberal arts it is rhetoric that has the greatest power to persuade Christians and to move them to an appropriate course of action. A rhetorician, Dymytrii doubtless identified the first subject of the soul's program for spiritual understanding with the first component of rhetoric—*inventio*. Hence, the first subject that Dymytrii's *Alphabet* imparts to his reader is the soul's inventiveness, its sources of spiritual wisdom.

Cicero identified rhetorical invention with *prudenter,* meaning "the wise forecast of the whole" and defined *inventio* as "the discovery of valid or seemingly valid arguments to render one's cause plausible."[86] In connection with this, Cicero emphasized the orator's need for a wide cultural background and knowledge:

> Eloquence is so potent a force that it embraces the origin and operation and developments of all things, all the virtues and duties, all the natural principles governing the morals and minds and life of mankind, and also determined their customs and laws and rights, and controls the government of the state, and expresses everything that concerns whatever topic in a graceful and flowing style.[87]

Hence, rhetorical invention consists of a prudent forecast of the task that lies ahead, and it is based on the speaker's wide knowledge and his experience of the world. It is at the beginning of his text that the rhetorician addresses the question of *inventio*—the background to his work, his purpose in writing, and the plan that he has worked out, and what his readers should expect to see in the work that follows.

---

[85] For a wider perspective on rhetoric's influence on European intellectuals during the Early Modern period, see Pierre Jodogne's essay "La rhétorique dans la formation des intellectuels" in Klaniczay, *L'époque de la Renaissance 1400–1600* 1: 226–236.

[86] Charles Baldwin, *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic* (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1959) 42.

[87] Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. H. Rackam (London: Cambridge UP, 1942) 3.20.76 (2: 76).

Dymytrii explains his reasons for writing the *Alphabet* in his "Foreword to the gentle reader."[88] Like Loyola's *Constitutions*, the *Alphabet* begins with a warning against the dangers of intellectualizing faith.[89] Intellectual speculation is not the means by which inner wisdom is acquired; rather, obedience to God's commandments is the path to spiritual understanding. As Dymytrii explains:

> At the beginning of this little booklet, the *Spiritual Alphabet*, in the place of the foreword, gentle reader, for the encouragement and exhortation for others, I put this before you: for it is first necessary to know the Alphabet well, before one can learn new words, and to fulfill [them] and to prepare good deeds. This little booklet is above all intended for the fulfillment of the Lord's commandments, and not for philosophizing on insensate things, nor inscribing superfluous things. Let us diligently fulfill [the commandments].[90]

The excerpt above from the foreword presents three basic ideas upon which Dymytrii constructs his *Alphabet*. First, the acquisition of spiritual understanding requires a systematic approach, comparable to a child's, learning of the alphabet. Second, acquisition of the basic skills taught in the *Alphabet* will enable the student to move on to a higher level of spiritual understanding—specifically a correct way of thinking that manifests itself in the performance of good deeds. Third, the intellectualizing of faith is an undesirable thing: speculation on the nature of the invisible world is a superfluous and vain endeavor. In this respect he is following the same pedagogical sequence advocated in Jan Comenius's *Pampaedia.*[91] Like his Czech counterpart, Dymytrii affirms that the first step toward true knowledge consists in adherence to God's commandments:

---

[88] «Предисловіе къ любезному читателю»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 288–89.

[89] See George Ganss's English translation of Loyola, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* (cited in fn. 63, above).

[90] «Прежде сея малыя книжицы, Алфавитъ Духовный, вмѣсто предисловія, любезный читателю, къ поощренію и наказанію комуждо самаго себе, напредѣ положихомъ: яко да прежде Алфавитъ добрѣ извыкши къ прочіихъ словесъ извычанію, и исполняти та дѣломъ уготовимся. Сія бо малая книжица, на поощреніе наипаче, и исполненіе Господнихъ заповѣдей, а не яко что велемудрствующе о вещехъ безмѣстныхъ, и излишнихъ начертася: яко да усерднѣ исполняемъ я»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 288. All English translations of Dymytrii's works are my own, unless otherwise credited. My English translations are given in text above, the Slavonic originals are given in the footnotes below. Translations that have been published elsewere are given in text with a footnote reference to the published source: the Slavonic originals of these published translations are not given in the footnotes.

> Therefore, by sampling from this book, let us willingly or unwillingly awaken ourselves to the fulfillment of the Lord's commandments, and let us compel ourselves to the purification of our passions.[92]

In this passage we note that obedience to God's commandments can be achieved in two ways: willingly or unwillingly, consciously or subconsciously. Here Dymytrii acknowledges a fundamental principle of Loyola's program for the education of children: that the learning process does not depend entirely on the will or understanding of the student. Loyola defended the teaching of philosophical and theological concepts by rote to very young children on the basis that, even if the child does not yet understand these things, he will come to understand them in time, if properly guided. Dymytrii, like Loyola, did not discount the will of the student in the learning process, as student motivation is crucial. However, Dymytrii does propose that human beings are able to acquire knowledge both consciously (i.e., with active participation) and unconsciously (i.e., independent of the individual's will).

Note also Dymytrii's use above of the first person plural: he breaks down the distance between author and reader, teacher and student. On one level this employment functions as a rhetorical device to engage the reader in an intellectual exchange. On another level Dymytrii is acknowledging that he is as much a student of Christian living as those whom he is addressing. And on another level he is indicating that spiritual understanding is not an individual pursuit, but a group effort. Ignatius Loyola emphasized the social context of Christian education, both in the means by which children are educated and in the goal of the educational program. Dymytrii likewise gives great importance to society and to human relationships in his approach to spiritual development.

---

[91] Comenius places good deeds at the beginning of his philological sequence, insisting that piety and good works come first, followed by good morals, and then finally attractive and pleasant literature. See Comenius, *Comenius's Pampaedia*, trans. A. Dobbie (Dover: Buckland Publications, 1986) 98–100.

[92] «Тѣмъ яко да начастше сію книжицу чтуще, волею и неволею возбуждати себе ко исполненію Господихъ заповѣдей, и ко очищеніемъ страстей понуждаемся»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 288.

This emphasis on social context goes beyond educational methodology, and extends into the field of rhetoric. Like education, rhetoric is a social activity for it involves a speaker, his listeners, and a social context. As Thomas Conley points out, this was the a concern that Erasmus addressed in his *Ciceronianus*:

> Sensitivity to language and a clear view of the social dimensions of eloquence are the main themes of another of Erasmus' works, the *Ciceronianus*, a satiric dialogue lampooning the so-called Ciceronians of his day. All of them, save Valla and Rudolf Agricola, for whom Erasmus saves special commendation, are guilty of idle, aimless, and pedantic posturing, posing as Ciceronians by using only words and expressions found in Cicero. Such erudition, Erasmus points out . . . misses the point of studying Cicero, for it ignores decorum—appropriateness to the given situation—thus sacrificing true eloquence for the sake of sounding good without really being so.[93]

Like Erasmus, Dymytrii holds nothing against the art of rhetoric; indeed, both men were masters of the art of persuasion. Dymytrii furthermore insists that rhetoric, like all kinds of outward learning, must be tempered by social context and dedicated to the glory of God. Dymytrii is not adverse to erudition—truly he was one of the most well-read and erudite men of his society. However, he gives stern warnings against the pride and vanity that are often the product of an education. Hence social *decorum* is essential if a man is to be truly learned in both outward and inward wisdom.

---

[93] Thomas M. Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990) 121.

Despite his emphasis on the social context of spiritual learning, Dymytrii never negates the value accorded to the individual human being in Christian doctrine. The intrinsic value that Dymytrii gives to the individual is seen in the emphasis he places on personal responsibility. In the passage cited above, Dymytrii tells his readers that they must awaken and compel themselves to the fulfillment of God's commandments and the purification of their passions. The individual is responsible for his own behavior and must assume stewardship for his own life. He must become self-aware through the awakening of his conscience. He must motivate and compel himself to live his life in accordance with God's commandments. This responsibility for one's own life goes hand-in-hand with repentance; the individual must desire to change his unruly ways and to strive for a more orderly and harmonious existence. The mortification of one's passions—the tempering of one's soul—is a task that requires enormous self-motivation and self-discipline.

However, the goal of Christian living, that is, the doing of good deeds for one's neighbors, cannot be achieved outside a social context. Herein lies Loyola's second principle of good education: it must prepare the student to participate in public life and contribute to society. Dymytrii's introductory words, "it is first necessary to know the Alphabet well, before one can learn new words, and to fulfill them and to prepare good deeds," make it clear that mastery of the *Alphabet* is only the first step toward the acquisition of inward knowledge. Once the *Alphabet* is learned, its principles must be applied to real life in the form of charitable deeds.

The primary purpose of Dymytrii's *Alphabet* is to instruct students in the art of living. Christian living takes place on two levels, that is, in this world and in the world to come. Not only does the *Alphabet* instruct pupils in how to interact with the world around them, it also serves to orient the mind and soul of the student towards heaven. Dymytrii's subtitled this introductory section "Concerning how to rejoice in the Lord alone, and not in the corruptible things of this world."[94] This subtitle recalls the book of Ecclesiastes (Eccles. 1.3) "What profit hath a man of all his labour which he hath taken under the sun?" and is comparable to Loyola's fourth, final, and most important requirement of education: to direct the human being toward heaven. The student must be taught to orient all his thoughts and deeds toward a higher purpose.

Concerning this need for the human being to orient himself toward God, Dymytrii begins by introducing a theme taken from the Psalms and from the Book of Tobit:

> Joy of mine, deliver me from my assailants" (Ps. 31.7).
> "Rejoice Tobit, may you have joy forever."[95]

Tobit replies to the angel;

> What kind of joy will this be of mine, for I sit in darkness and am unable to see the light of the heavens?[96]

Dymytrii's voice continues where Tobit's ends:

> Indeed, what sort of joy can the soul have, in this vale of tears, in this darkness and in this antechamber of death, sitting in the mute consequences [of ancestral sin], with nothing to hope for, only death, only a breaking away from this world, only an obscure demise.[97]

---

[94] «О еже точію о единомъ Господѣ радоватися подобаетъ а не о тлѣнныхъ міра сего вещехъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* on pages1: 282–288.

[95] «Радосте моя, избави мя от обышедщихъ мя» . . . «Радуйся, Товіе, радость тебѣ всегда да будетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 282. My translation of the Biblical passage above is from Dymytrii's Slavonic original.

[96] «Кая радость мнѣ будетъ, яко во тмѣ сѣжу, свѣта небеса не вижду»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 282.

[97] «Что убо за радость имать быти души, во удолѣ семъ плачевнѣмъ [in the 1741 edition: во юдоли сей плачевнѣй], въ темныхъ и сѣни смертнѣй, въ безсловесныхъ наслѣдіяхъ сѣдя, ничтоже ино надѣяся, точію смерти, точію

To illustrate, Dymytrii gives a two-page list of good reasons not to be joyful, demonstrating the inevitability of suffering, sickness, pain and death. Clearly, the present world is a world of sorrows. Following his litany of unhappy things, Dymytrii then answers Tobit's question regarding happiness:

> For this reason, do not rejoice in this time, in this age of tears; on the contrary, all that is within it is impermanent and false; all within it is false and transient. But rather, if you wish to be comforted, seek comfort in the Lord alone. If you wish to rejoice, rejoice in the Lord alone. For the joy of the flesh quickly perishes, but joy in the Lord endures forever.[98]

Dymytrii warns his readers of the dangers of false joy:

> All joy, if it is not in the Lord, is a falsehood, a deception. All comfort, if it is not in God, is a burden and a confusion of the soul.[99]

Here he raises a crucial idea: the ability to discern between false and true joy, and between false and true comfort, is essential for the well-being of the soul. Falsehood and deception result in burden and confusion, and this disorder has a crippling effect on the soul. In Dymytrii's sermons, emotional disorder is understood as a confusion of the soul, symptomatic of a breakdown in the human being's ability to reason and understand. In Dymytrii's psychology, healing the troubled mind consists of restoring the mind's ability to discern between truth and falsehood, thereby returning harmony and order to the soul.

This idea of "confusion" is central to Dymytrii's ethics. For Dymytrii, sin is

---

отсюду разлученія, точію безвѣстныя кончины»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 282.

[98] «Сего ради не радуйся ни о чесомже временномъ въ вѣцѣ семъ плачевномъ, понеже все въ немъ непостоянно и превратно, все въ немъ ложно есть и премѣнно. Но, аще хощеши утѣшитися, о Господѣ единомъ утѣшайся. Аще хощеши радоватися, о Господѣ единомъ радуйся. Радость бо плотская вскорѣ погибаетъ, о Господѣ же радость пребываетъ во вѣки»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 284.

[99] «Всяка бо радость, аще не о Господѣ, ложъ есть, прелесть есть. Всяко утѣшеніе, аще не о Бозѣ, тяжесть есть, и смущеніе души»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 284. Here the author is clearly evoking the text of Ecclesiastes "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity . . . " (Eccles. 1.2).

nothing but spiritual confusion. The healthy spirit is able to exercise correct judgement and thereby choose good over evil. The unhealthy spirit is literally a "dis-ordered" one—one in which the natural, correct order has been disturbed. This confusion of the soul results in a breakdown of good judgment. For Dymytrii the concept of sin is not one of a corrupt human nature. In accordance with Orthodox dogmatic theology he affirms that although sinful human beings suffer the consequences of Adam's first transgression—i.e., death and corruption—the sinful act itself is one of individual will and not of human nature. The sinful human being suffers from a spiritual affliction that brings chaos to the natural harmony that God has ordered in the human soul. Consequently, the individual's ability to make correct choices is impaired, and he sins.

Dymytrii's Alphabet Sequence: The Verses

A good instructor always provides his students with a clear and orderly syllabus at the commencement of academic study. Dymytrii likewise begins his *Spiritual Alphabet* with an alphabetical outline for his readers. The letters of the Slavonic alphabet are listed and each letter is accompanied by a verse describing an essential concept that must be mastered by students of the *Alphabet*'s spiritual program.

Dymytrii's presents his alphabetical syllabus as presented below. The numbers assigned to each verse for reference purposes are my additions. Thirty-five alphabet characters are used.[100] Numerical symbolism is obviously at work here: thirty-five is the multiple of five times seven, five being the number of the senses and seven representing the seven virtues. Thus sensibility and pious behavior are the principal ideas behind these alphabet verses.

---

[100] The 1741 Kyiv edition of the *Alphabet* gives only 31 characters, and several of the verses are rearranged accordingly. See the appendix for a comparison of the two editions, and a brief discussion of the *Alphabet*'s letters and their departure from the Slavonic alphabet's normative order.

1. Under the letter А:

> I, of Adam's nature, advise you, also of Adam's nature, to be humble. Being of Adam's nature, be humble, remembering the righteous pronouncement that was proclaimed: "for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shall return." [101]

2. Under the letter Б:

> Know God and understand his good works. Walk according to his commandments, so that you may inherit eternal goodness.[102]

3. Under the letter В:

> Believe in God, and believe God. At all times have temperance in all things. Always remember death and the passing of all things. Do not be at all of this world.[103]

4. Under the letter Г:

> Beware of every sin, great and small. At all times keep your own transgression before your eyes, so that each day you diligently strive for repentance.[104]

---

[101] «Азъ, Адама естества сый, тевѣ обоего пола естества Адамля, совѣтую: смиренъ буди. Адамля естества сый, смиренъ буди, памятствуя праведнаго осужденія слово реченное: яко земля еси, и въ землю паки пойдеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[102] «Бога познавай, благодѣянія его разумѣй, въ заповѣдехъ его ходи, да наслѣдникъ будеши вѣчныхъ благъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[103] «Вѣруй въ Бога, вѣруй Богу, воздержаніе всегда въ всемъ имѣй, присно памятствуй смерть, и всѣхъ вещей измѣненіе, и ни единымъ чимъ ятъ будеши въ мірѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[104] «Грѣха от мала даже до велика блюдися, грѣхъ твой пред очима всегда имѣй, яко да усерднѣ на всякъ день прилѣжиши покаянію»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

5. Under the letter д:

> Day after day ascend the mountain of good deeds. Every day apply zeal upon zeal, so that you always walk the pathways of truth.[105]

6. Under the letter є:

> For the virtuous man there is hope, and each man's labor and struggle will be rewarded with eternal rest and happiness in the age to come.[106]

7. Under the letter ж:

> At all times remember eternal life and the coming goodness, so that you occupy your heart with this always.[107]

8. Under the letter ѕ:

> Be very careful and diligent in your position and in yourself, lest you waste your life in vain.[108]

9. Under the letter з:

> Behold the created world, and marvel, and glorify the Creator of the world. Do not place your sensibilities in the created world, rather, direct your heart and soul to God the Creator.[109]

10. Under the letter и:

> To him who has zeal for goodness, it shall be given, "but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath" (Matt. 25.29).[110]

---

[105] «Денъ от дне къ горѣ добродѣтелей восходи, усердіе ко усердію непрестанно на всякъ денъ прилагай, да утравиши тебе во вся стези правы»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[106] «Есть бо благимъ надежда, и всякому труду и подвигъ вѣчной покой и веселіе, въ грядущемъ вѣцѣ возмездіе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[107] «Жизнь вѣчную, и грядущая благая присно да поминаеши, яко да къ симъ всегда взимаеттися сердце»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[108] «Зѣло тщасливъ и усерденъ во твоемъ званіи и своествѣ [in the 1741 edition: должности] буди, яко да не всуе изнуряеши твою жизнь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[109] «Зря тварь, чудися, и Творцу твари славословіе приноси, не къ твари прилагай твоя чувства, но къ Богу Творцу всѣхъ сердце и душу возводи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[110] «Иже о благомъ имать усердіе, дастся ему: а иже не имать, и еже мнится имѣяй, возмется от него»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

11. Under the letter І:

> Love truth, and beware of all kinds of iniquity, so that you escape the words of the prophet: "Thou shalt destroy them that speak iniquity" (Ps. 5.6).[111]

12. Under the letter К:

> At all times unceasingly direct your mind and soul to God, and at no time let him out of your heart and memory, so that always you shall be as one with him.[112]

13. Under the letter Л:

> Endeavor to love God with all your heart and with all your strength, so that you come to know your salvation, and liberate yourself from all earthly passions.[113]

14. Under the letter М:

> Apply yourself to prayer without ceasing, for this is a treasure that cannot be stolen; it is the ladder by which you ascend to God.[114]

15. Under the letter Н:

> Do not apply your heart to earthly things, lest you become like salt that has lost its savor, lest you present yourself completely indecent. Instead, nail your heart and soul to God alone, so that you are immovable in your love for him.[115]

---

[111] «Истину люби, всякія лжи блюдися, да убѣжиши пророческаго реченія: погубиши всякаго глаголющаго лжу»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291. Note that the two Slavonic characters І and И interchangeable; this likely reflects the normalization of these alphabet characters to conform with Russian pronunciation.

[112] «Къ Богу всегда умъ твой и душу непрестанно возводи, и никогдаже его от сердца и памяти твоей испускай, яко да всегда съ нимъ соединенъ будеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[113] «Любити Бога от всего сердца твоего, и от всея крѣпости твоея потщися: яко да извѣстенъ спасенія твоего будеши, и всякаго пристрастія земнаго свободишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[114] «Молитвѣ непрестанно прилѣжи, то бо есть некрадомое сокровище, еюже удобь, яко лѣствицею, къ Богу взыйдеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[115] «Не прилагай сердца твоего къ земнымъ, да не яко соль обуяеши, и весь непотребенъ явишися, но къ Богу единому сердце и душу твою пригвожденну имѣй, яко да неподвижимь въ любви его пребудеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

16. Under the letter О:

> For he is the one Lord, the source of all goodness, and the giver of eternal life.[116]

17. Under the letter П:

> Always remember the Lord. At all times may his name be in your heart and upon your lips. Always endeavor for repentance, and every day bathe your soul in warm tears, that you should appear whiter than snow, and not appear before the Lord with a face covered in shame.[117]

18. Under the letter Р:

> As often as possible zealously raise your hands in prayer to God. Finding your help in this, you shall defeat the mind's Amalek, that is, the devil.[118]

19. Under the letter С:

> Remembering death, beware of stinginess and parsimony. Let not your faithlessness and stinginess accompany you at the time of your passing, lest you shut yourself out from the doors of Divine Mercy.[119]

20. Under the letter Т:

> Be meek, unassuming, and humble to all, so thus you shall be recognized as a true follower and disciple of Christ, without blemish.[120]

---

[116] «Онъ бо есть единъ Господь, источникъ всѣхъ благъ и вѣчныя жизни податель»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[117] «Памятствуй о Господѣ выну, въ сердцѣ и во устѣхъ твоихъ да пребываетъ имя его всегда. Покаянію присно прилѣжи, и на всякъ день теплѣ слезами омывай душу твою, да убѣлишися паче снѣга, и не посрамленъ лицемъ пред Господемъ явишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[118] «Руцѣ твои къ Богу наичастѣе въ молитвѣ воздѣвай усерднѣ, оттуду помощи всегда взыскуя, да побѣдиши мысленнаго амалика, сирѣчь, діавола»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[119] «Смерть памятствуя, скупости и стѣсненія блюдися, да не невѣріемъ и скупостію ятъ бывши во время исхода, милосердія Божія дбери себѣ затвориши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[120] «Тихъ, безтщеславенъ и кротокъ ко всѣмъ бывай, яко да истиненъ Хрістовъ подражатель и ученикъ безпорока явишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

21. Under the letter У/ОV:

> If you wish to gain anon the eternal treasure, then guard yourself against languor and idleness.[121]

22. Under the letter У/ОV:[122]

> Be always zealous and warm unto the Lord, so that you may participate in the life eternal.[123]

23. Under the letter Ф:

> Struggle to drown the mind's Pharaoh in the water of your tears, so that he does not forever assault you, persecuting you.[124]

24. Under the letter Х:

> Seek Christ only, so that you dwell with him in eternity. They that seek him shall find great loving kindness, and they shall not want for any good thing (Ps. 34.10).[125]

25. Under the letter О$^{\text{Т}}$:[126]

> Know your father and mother, friends and kin; know God and know yourself. For he is the beginning of life and the end of all that is without end.[127]

---

[121] «Унынія и лѣности зѣло хранися, аще хощеши вскорѣ снискати вѣчное сокровище»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[122] The 1842 edition of the *Alphabet* gives the letter У/ОV twice. It is possible the author or the translator may be playing with Pythagorean symbolic values. The Neo-Pythagoreans assigned to the Roman letter Y the symbolic value of dualism and conflict; indeed the beginning words of the *Alphavet*'s two V verses are antonyms, languor (*unyniia*) and zeal (adj. *userden"*). For more on Pythagorean alphabet symbolism, see Johanna Drucker, *The Alphabetic Labyrinth: The Letters in History and Imagination* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1995).

[123] «Усердень и теплъ къ Богу присно буди, да причастникъ будеши вѣчныя жизни»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[124] «Фараона мысленнаго въ водѣ слезной потопити тщися, да не всегда ратуя гонитъ тя»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[125] «Хріста единаго взыскуй, да съ нимъ пребудеши во вѣки. Взыскующіи бо его обрящутъ велію милость, и не лишатся всякаго блага»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[126] Several versions of the "Prayer of Constantine" use the superscript variant О$^{\text{Т}}$ rather than the omega ѡ variant. See the example in Kujo Kuev, *Azbuchnata molitva v slavianskite literaturi* (Sofiia: Bulgarska akademiia na naukite, 1974) 206.

[127] «Отца и матерь, други и сродники, и Бога быти себѣ знай: онъ бо есть жизни начало, и конецъ всѣмъ безконечный»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

26. Under the letter Ц:

> May the Lord alone be your goal and your refuge. May his most holy love be your hope and confidence.[128]

27. Under the letter Ч:

> Truly love purity and chastity, for the pure adhere themselves to the pure One. Do not forget to repent regularly, lest you fail to correct yourself at the appointed time.[129]

28. Under the letter Ш:

> Let these six-winged virtues always be companion to your soul: (1) diligence; (2) love of others; (3) patience; (4) the image of goodness; (5) reasoning; (6) and love, so that by means of them it should be proper that you raise yourself up to heaven.[130]

29. Under the letter Щ:

> Be generous and kind to all, so that on the day of final judgement you will present your soul to the Lord in kindness and goodness. Keep this one thing in your memory at all times, so that you please God always, and that you forever ascend to him in love.[131]

30. Under the letter Ю:

> Cast out from yourself your youthful, desirous, passionate follies. Rather, at all times zealously apply yourself to the Divine wisdom of God.[132]

---

[128] «Цѣль твоя и пристанище Господь единъ да будетъ, надежда же и упованіе, пресвятая его любовь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[129] «Чистоту и цѣломудріе истинно возлюби, да прилѣпишися чистѣ чистому: и часъ от часа покаянія не отлагай, да не погубиши времене исправленія всуе во время часа»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[130] «Шестокрилни добродѣтели, водруженни въ души твоей всегда да будутъ: сирѣчь, усердіе, друголюбіе, терпѣніе, образъ благъ, разсужденіе, и любовь, имже удобъ на небо возвысишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[131] «Щедръ и милостивъ ко всѣмъ буди, да милостива и благоутробна Господа въ день страшнаго суда душѣ твоей обрящеши. Едино се въ памяти своей имѣти выну, да Богу единому всегда угождаеши, и къ нему любовію присно да восходиши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[132] «Юностное похотное плотское безуміе от себе отметай, премудрости же духовныя о Бозѣ всегда поучайся всеусерднѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

31. Under the letter я:

> Be very careful of rage, anger, and malediction, lest the eye of your heart becomes obscured.[133]

32. Under the letter ω:

> Be very careful of gluttony and drunkenness, lest you completely succumb to evil forever.[134]

33. Under the letter Ȍ[135]

> Do not forsake the instruction of your spiritual father, lest you stumble along your paths.[136]

34. Under the letter Ψ:

> Glorify God in psalms and hymns without ceasing, may this always be a comfort unto you.[137]

35. Under the letter θ:

> Be very careful of pharisaic, conceited hypocrisy, lest you pay the price for your vanity, instead of being rewarded for your goodness.[138]

Dymytrii's decision to arrange the verses above alphabetically and visually supply each verse with a corresponding letter imitates a pedagogical tool that was quickly spreading throughout Russia at the very time of his writing: the alphabet primer. It was only in the year 1679 that Symeon Polotsky published the first Slavonic primer in Muscovy; however, by the 1690s major innovations were already occurring in the field of Russian primary education and the use of such books. Max Okenfuss proposes that the appearance of the first illustrated primers in Russia in the 1690s—clearly intended for children and not adults—marks the true discovery of childhood in Russia and an approach to education that accounts for the differences in thinking between children and adults.[139] Dymytrii was doubtless familiar with Karion Istomin (1640–1717) and the new illustrated primer Istomin published in Moscow in 1696. Whereas Istomin's illustrated primers provided children with visual examples for each letter of the alphabet, Dymytrii's *Alphabet* provides the learner with invisible, abstract concepts to be associated with each letter.

---

[133] «Ярости, гнѣва и злословія зѣло блюдися, да не помрачиттися сердечное око»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[134] «Обяденія и піянства зѣло блюдися, да не во вся злая впадаеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[135] Note that in the 1842 alphabet the letter O is given twice (i.e., O and Ȍ), and long ω is also given twice in the form of the Greek omega character and in the superscript variant o^{T}. Also, the letter "ksi" (Ѯ) is missing, it normally preceeds Ψ'.

[136] «Отеческаго духовнаго наказанія не преобижай, да не въ стезяхъ твоихъ преткнешися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[137] «Псалмы и пѣсньми Бога безпрестанно славослови, да присно сіе имаши себѣ во утѣшеніе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[138] «Фарісейскаго тщеславнаго лицемѣрія зѣло блюдися, да не восплащеніе твоихъ благъ себѣ тщеславіемъ здѣ мзду воспріимеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

If we examine these abstract primer concepts, we see that Dymytrii's alphabet sequence begins with the need to acknowledge one's human weakness and to find humility in this: "Being of Adam's nature, be humble, remembering the righteous pronouncement that was proclaimed: 'for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shall return.'" This theme of humility is connected to the warning against vanity that concludes the alphabet sequence: "Be very careful of pharisaic, conceited hypocrisy, lest you pay the price for your vanity." If Christians fail to be vigilant of their conceit and hypocrisy, the cost for their vanity will be paid in the life to come. Humility is the first and most important step in avoiding this temptation. Dymytrii's sequence thus ends with a powerful idea: those who study the *Alphabet*'s sequence and master its principles must beware of complacency. Those who become learned in matters secular and spiritual may easily stumble on their own vanity. Hence, students who complete the alphabetical sequence must maintain vigilance over their pride, and always return to the first principle of inward knowledge: humility. In this regard the

---

[139] Max Okenfuss, *The Discovery of Childhood in Russia: The Evidence of the Slavic Primer* (Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1980) 22.

Spiritual Alphabet is both a progressive learning sequence and a cycle of spiritual awareness. Dymytrii's *Alphabet* is not an achievement-oriented program for spiritual perfection, but rather a course in self-knowledge, self-understanding, beginning and ending with the acknowledgement of one's imperfection and weakness. The goal of the program is not personal fulfillment, but union with God: "May the Lord alone be your goal and your refuge. May his most holy love be your hope and confidence."[140]

The first letters of Dymytrii's alphabet reiterate the idea that true happiness is to be found in God and not in the sensible world. The human being's relationship to the sensible world, however, is not one of animosity. Rather than fleeing from the material world, Christians are to employ it for salvation. The created world is not evil: on the contrary, it serves a Divine purpose, that of directing the human soul toward heaven. As Dymytrii explains under the letter "З":

> Behold the created world, and marvel, and glorify the Creator of the world. Do not place your sensibilities in the created world, rather, direct your heart and soul to God the Creator.[141]

In his explanation, we see a soul-world relationship that is both neo-Platonic and humanist. Dymytrii follows Plato's belief that knowledge is a kind of perception or sensation. Plato presented the view that knowledge is equivalent to seeing, hearing and so on.[142] Dymytrii similarly equates sensory experience with outward understanding. Here then is the basic flaw of outward wisdom: human beings are dependent upon their eyes and ears to inform them of the world. But the human senses are imperfect and cannot perceive the inward nature of things. Hence, Dymytrii cautions his readers to beware of the things that they see and hear.

---

[140] «Цѣль твоя и пристанище Господь единъ да будетъ, надежда же и упованіе, пресвятая его любовь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[141] «Зря тварь, чудися, и Творцу твари славословіе приноси, не къ твари прилагай твоя чувства, но къ Богу Творцу всѣхъ сердце и душу возводи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[142] See: Pamela Huby, "Socrates and Plato" in *A Critical History of Western Philosophy*, ed. D. O'Connor (London: Free Press, 1964) 26.

This distinction between exterior and interior sensibilities is one that draws from Antiquity and from Medieval writings on the five senses. Dymytrii is here adhering to a humanist understanding of the senses, as represented in the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Caelius Rhodiginus.[143] The exterior senses are the messengers of the mind, comparable to the angels; the interior senses, those faculties of the mind which adapt and judge the impressions communicated by the exterior senses.[144] Rhodiginus offers an image based on Plato's *Phaedrus*: the five senses are the runaway horses; the mind, the charioteer who holds in the reins of the rushing animals.[145]

The role of the five senses in the task of spiritual mindfulness will be elaborated upon in chapter four of this thesis, "*Memoria Spiritualis.*" However, here it is important to note that as a humanist Dymytrii proposes a Christian approach to dealing with the sensible illusions of this world: "Do not place your sensibilities on the created world, rather, direct your heart and soul to God the Creator." Like Ignatius Loyola's *Constitutions*, Dymytrii's *Alphabet* affirms that the highest and most important goal of education is to direct the student's heart and mind toward heaven. Dymytrii's teaching on sensibility may be compared with Marcilo Ficino's belief that the proper use of the senses is to direct the human being upward:

---

[143] See the chapter entitled "The Anatomy of the Senses and its Imagery" in Louise Vinge, *The Five Senses: Studies in a Literary Tradition* (Lund: Liber Laromedel,1975) 74–77.

[144] Cited in Vinge 77. See: Caelius Rhodiginus, *Lectiones Antiquae* (Frankfurt, 1666) 13: 21, col. 100E.

[145] Cited in Vinge 77. See: Caelius Rhodiginus, *Lectiones Anitiquae* (Frankfurt, 1666) 13: 21, col. 102E.

> And so all love begins with sight. But the love of the contemplative man ascends from sight into the mind; that of the voluptuous man descends from sight into touch, and that of the practical man remains in the form of sight.[146]

For Ficino, as for Dymytrii, the physical sensibilities of the flesh are not the bearers of evil; rather, it is the intellect that is responsible for exercising good judgement and turning the flesh away from evil. This is clear in Dymytrii's "Sermon on the Sunday of Last Judgement." On Judgement Day the Body and Soul argue over who is responsible for the sinful state into which they have fallen.[147] Although these two sinned together, Dymytrii argues that the Body could not have done any of his sinful deeds without the approval and direction of the Soul. The Soul possesses free will, understanding, reason and good judgement. If she fails to exercise these appropriately, then together with the Body she will perish. Thus the flesh is not evil by its nature, but rather it is the soul's judgement that determines whether the human being will perform virtuous deeds, or evil ones. As Louise Vinge explains:

> Medieval ethics was very much preoccupied with the senses. They were not regarded as evil in themselves, but open to good and bad impulses, and therefore must be kept under constant guard. They are messengers to the soul, or its gates, and the moral purity of the soul therefore depends on how the senses withstand temptations.[148]

Dymytrii agrees that it is not sensibility that must be shunned, but illusion. The world itself has been created beautiful and good, and divine truths are inscribed everywhere in God's Creation. It is deception and falsehood are the things that Christians must beware of. In order to avoid these traps, he argues, God has given us reason and understanding. To ensure good judgement and clarity of their inward sensibilities, at all times Christians must direct their minds and souls to God:

---

[146] Vinge 72.

[147] For an analysis of this sermon within the context of Renaissance Body and Soul dialogues, see this dissertation's third chapter, "*Dispositio Spiritualis.*" In my English translation of Dymytrii's Body-Soul dialogue I have retained the feminine gender of the soul (Slavonic *dusha*) found in the original.

[148] Vinge 78.

> At all times unceasingly direct your mind and soul to God, and at no time let him out of your heart and memory, so that always you shall be as one with him.[149]

To maintain the good judgement necessary for virtuous living, mindfulness is required. Mindfulness must be continuous and uninterrupted, and it must be internalized within the heart and the memory. This idea of mindfulness plays a fundamental role in Dymytrii's teaching on the soul's Pronunciation through prayer, and it forms the basis of his examination of the soul's Memory of God's benevolence and his final judgement. These two subjects—the Pronunciation and Memory of the soul—will be dealt with extensively in the last two chapters.

The Chapters of the Spiritual Alphabet

The thirty-five alphabetic verses that introduce the work are followed by the actual chapters that constitute the larger part of the *Spiritual Alphabet*'s text. Dymytrii employs thirty-three chapters, each one corresponding to one year in the life of Christ, representing the Incarnation of God's Son, through whom humanity is redeemed. Cooperation with Divine will and union with God's Son are the goal of Christian living. Hence the thirty-three years of Jesus' carnal life on earth constitute the framework for the entire text of Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet*.

The thirty three chapters are divided into three parts, made up of twelve, ten, and eleven chapters respectively. They are titled as follows:

---

[149] «Къ Богу всегда умъ твой и душу непрестанно возводи, и никогдаже его от сердца и памяти твоей испускай, яко да всегда съ нимъ соединенъ будеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

Part One:

Chapter One: On how the principle cause of Adam's fall was his misunderstanding and his utter self-ignorance.[150]

Chapter Two: On how is proper to act with reason, and to obey the Lord's commandments.[151]

Chapter Three: On how if a person does not act according to reason, and does not purify his reason, then his reason is not right nor is it true.[152]

Chapter Four: On how it is that spiritual labor is a burden and a struggle as long as one does not enter into the enlightenment of the understanding.[153]

Chapter Five: On how in all things one should follow the path of understanding and good judgement, and not that of the inarticulate flesh.[154]

Chapter Six: On how one should be inclined to fasting, and have temperance in all things.[155]

Chapter Seven: On how one should not be enslaved to the delightful passions of the flesh, but always seek spiritual comfort in the Lord.[156]

Chapter Eight: On how at all times one should follow reason in all things, and not dumb, carnal desire.[157]

Chapter Nine: On how one should not strike others, and not be enslaved to carnal desire.[158]

---

[150] «О еже первѣйшая вина бысть Адамлю паденію, неразуміе, и всеконечное себе непознаніе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[151] «О еже дѣлати подобаетъ разумомъ, и хранити Господня заповѣди»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 296.

[152] «О еже не дѣлаяй кто разумомъ, и не очищаяй его, не правъ и не истиненъ есть разумъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 300.

[153] «О еже дотолѣ въ дѣланіи духовномъ трудъ есть и подвигъ, доидеже не пріидетъ кто въ просвѣщеніе разума» —Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 304.

[154] «О еже во всемъ послѣдовати разуму и разсужденію, неже [1741 edition: а не] безсловесной плоти»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 308.

[155] «О еже предпочитати постъ и имѣти во всемъ воздержаніе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 310.

[156] «О еже не порабощатися плотскими сладострастьми, но духовнаго утѣшенія въ Господѣ взыскивати выну»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 313.

[157] «О еже всегда во всемъ послѣдовати разуму, не безсловеснымъ плотскимъ похотемъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 317.

[158] «О еже не уязвлятися лицами, и не порабощатися похотію плотскою»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 321.

Chapter Ten: On how one should not be enslaved to lascivious thoughts and obscene desires.[159]

Chapter Eleven: On how there is nothing natural about man's carnal desire, but rather, this came into our nature as a consequence of Adam's transgression.[160]

Chapter Twelve: On how one should not give one's heart to present concerns, and not seek refuge and comfort in earthly delights, but rather seek the One Lord God at all times.[161]

Part Two:

Chapter One: On how in all things one should avoid vain praise.[162]

Chapter Two: On how one should not take great satisfaction in the honor and glory of men, for these are an illusion.[163]

Chapter Three: On how one should not take pride in anything of this time.[164]

Chapter Four: On how in all things and at all times one should be humble before God and before men.[165]

Chapter Five: On how one should refrain from self-importance.[166]

Chapter Six: On how one should not judge another person, but instead examine one's own evil deeds.[167]

---

[159] «О еже не порабощатися блудными помысли и скверными похотьми»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 323.

[160] «О еже яко нѣсть свойственна человѣку плотская похоть, но от преступленія Адамля роду нашему прибывшая»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 328.

[161] «О еже не прилагати сердца своего къ настоящымъ вещемъ, и не искати въ земныхъ сластехъ покоя и утѣшенія точію во единомъ Господѣ Бозѣ взыскивати выну»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 334.

[162] «О еже блюстися во всѣхъ вещехъ суетнаго велехваленія»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 339.

[163] «О еже не зѣло утѣшатися о почитанію и славѣ человѣчестѣй, прелеста бо суть»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 344.

[164] «О еже не гордитися ни единою вещію въ вѣцѣ семъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 348.

[165] «О еже во всемъ всегда смирятися предъ Богомъ и человѣки»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 354.

[166] «О еже не мало что о себѣ мнѣти»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 359.

[167] «О еже не осуждати кого инаго, но паче своя зрѣти злая»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 364.

Chapter Seven: On how one should avoid laughter, idle talk and blasphemy.[168]

Chapter Eight: On how at all times one should repent and weep for one's own sins in this vale of tears.[169]

Chapter Nine: On how at all times one should remember death, and not be deceived by the corruptible things of this world.[170]

Chapter Ten: On how there is no refuge in the things of this world; only in the One Lord God is there eternal refuge.[171]

Part Three:

Chapter One: On how one should not love money, but instead place one's hope in God alone.[172]

Chapter Two: On how one should not envy another person, nor [covet] anything of this world.[173]

Chapter Three: On how one should not become angry, nor hold resentments towards others.[174]

Chapter Four: On how one should not suffer too much in one's sufferings.[175]

Chapter Five: On how all the saints spent their entire lives in grief and sorrow.[176]

Chapter Six: On how one should suffer everything valiantly.[177]

---

[168] «О еже блюстися смѣха празднословіа же и кощунствъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 368.

[169] «О еже всегда каятися и плакати о согрѣшеніихъ своихъ во юдоли сей плачевнѣй»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 372.

[170] «О еже памятствовати всегда смерть, и не прельщатися тлѣнными сего міра вещми»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 377.

[171] «О еже яко нѣсть не во единой міра сего вещи покоя, точію во единомъ Господѣ Бозѣ вѣчный есть покой»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 381.

[172] «О еже не сребролюбствовати, но на Бога точію единаго имѣти упованіе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 387.

[173] «О еже не завидѣти кому ни во единою вещи сего міра»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 390.

[174] «О еже не гнѣватися, и не памятозлобствовати на когоже»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 394.

[175] «О еже не зѣло скорбѣти въ скорбныхъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 397.

[176] «О еже яко вси святіи въ скорбехъ и печалехъ изнуриша всю свою жизнь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 402.

[177] «О еже терпѣти вся находящая доблественно»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 408.

Chapter Seven: On how one should not be idle, but instead discipline oneself with godly deeds at all times.[178]

Chapter Eight: On how one should not be idle and languorous, but at all time day and night be filled with zeal and inner warmth.[179]

Chapter Nine: On how one should stir up within oneself zeal and warmth for the Lord at all times.[180]

Chapter Ten: On how one should direct all one's desire to God, and to bond unto him in love.[181]

Chapter Eleven: On how one is to love the one God, and to hold nothing in higher esteem than his love.[182]

Dymytrii's division of the thirty-three chapters into three groups of twelve, ten, and eleven is a mystery—three equal groups of eleven would have made more sense. It is possible that he may be playing with Pythagorean number and with alphabet symbolism. The first letter of the Slavonic alphabet (а) bears the name "Adam" in Dymytrii's preceding alphabet verse; hence, it is readily associated with cosmology and human nature. The second part of Dymytrii's *Alphabet* begins with the thirteenth chapter of the book. In his preceding alphabet verse he assigned the name "love" to the thirteenth letter of his alphabet (л). Thus he may have wished to associate the second part of the *Alphabet* with the individual's need to interact lovingly with God and with others. The third part of Dymytrii's *Alphabet* begins with the twenty-third chapter of the book. In his preceding alphabet verse he assigned the name "Pharaoh" to the twenty-third letter of the alphabet (ф). Hence, it may be temptation and the need to live one's life virtuously that he wished to represent symbolically by beginning the third part of the *Alphabet* with the twenty-third chapter.[183]

---

[178] «О еже не лѣнитися, но трезвитися въ дѣлѣ Божіи выну»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 413.

[179] «О еже не лѣниву быти, не унывати, но всегда день и нощь усердствовати и пещися о себѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 419.

[180] «О еже возбуждати себе всегда ко усердствованію и теплотѣ Господней»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 426.

[181] «О еже все желаніе свое имѣти къ Богу, и любовію къ нему прилѣплятися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 428.

[182] «О еже ко единому Богу имѣти любовь, и ничтоже предпочитати паче его любве»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 430.

Looking closer at the titles of the chapters above, we see Dymytrii's emphasis on spiritual servitude and obedience. For Dymytrii, such servitude bears cosmological significance, for spiritual obedience means a return to the state of goodness and harmony natural to the individual human being and to all of God's creation. In such a state the human being acts in accordance with God's will, and in this oneness of will and purpose finds union with God. To achieve this, Dymytrii recommends a strategy employed by rhetoricians since ancient times: the human soul must learn the art of invention:

> Therefore, he who wishes to know himself, and to know God truly, and to unite with him in love, let him first become knowledgeable of the created world, visible and invisible, and know all its things, and examine all the created world, for whom and for what sake these things exist, in which there is nothing concealed, nor is there anything that was not thoughtfully conceived, including one's self and all the mysteries of one's self, and God, and all his ineffable good deeds, and in this manner come to a completeness of all knowledge. For it is proper to understand from a lower place things that are higher up. For we do not ascend from a higher place to a place that is lower, but rather, from the lower place to the higher. For this reason, God has placed, before our eyes, all the created world and all the worldly composition to serve as a teaching place, or as a mirror (*zertsalo*), so that we should learn how to ascend from lower levels to higher ones. If we do not become knowledgeable of the lower things, how can we have understanding of higher things?[184]

---

[183] In the 1741 edition of the *Alphabet*, however, the numbering and order of the preceding alphabet verses is different, and so the names assigned to the numerical alphabet letters is not the same as the 1841 edition found in the *Sochineniia*. In 1741 the values are 1="Adam"; 13="Prayer"; 23="Goal" (see appendix). Different editions notwithstanding, I believe that the important thing is that Dymytrii was consciously choosing how many chapters would constitute each of the three parts, and this was likely done in accordance with the symbolic values that he assigned to these alphabet letters and their corresponding numerical values.

[184] «Тѣмже, аще кто истинно хощетъ познати Господа, познати себе, и съ нимъ любовію соединитися, да познаетъ первѣе всю тварь, видимую и разумѣваемую да увѣсть всѣхъ вещей, и всея твари разсмотреніе, и кого, и чесо ради сія суть, въ еже ни единой вещи утаеннѣй и недоумѣннѣй быти от него, таже себе и все еже о себѣ таинство, таже Бога, и вся его

For Dymytrii, inventiveness is the first step along the path of spiritual wholeness. As the rhetorician cannot contemplate the composing of a speech without a proper background in all kinds of knowledge, so too the human being must become well-learned in the world that surrounds him. Everything that exists in the world serves a higher purpose, that of directing God's creation back to its Creator. This spiritual invention plays a central part in Dymytrii's Life of St. Barbara, as we shall see below in this chapter.

Fundamental to Dymytrii's program is his belief that spiritual knowledge may be acquired by means of a pedagogical sequence. Just as Comenius believed that a child's education develops according to a sequential order,[185] Dymytrii likewise maintained that spiritual learning takes place in an orderly progression. Children begin their studies by learning the things around them that are most immediate and easiest to grasp. Likewise the soul begins its education by observing the created world and the wisdom that God has inscribed on his creation. As children through their school lessons advance from simple concepts to more abstract and complex ones, so too does the soul move from its understanding of the created world, to an understanding of the Creator who ordered and arranged the created world in his wisdom.

Dymytrii's idea of spiritual ascent according to a proper sequence presents nothing new. Compare Dymytrii's and Loyola's pedagogical

---

неизреченная благодѣянія, и тако приходитъ въ совершенное всего познаніе. Ибо подобаетъ дольняя вся разумѣти, таже горняя. Не бо от горнихъ на нижняя восходити должни есмы, но от дольныхъ на вышняя. Того бо ради всю тварь, и все мірское устроеніе, якоже нѣкое училище, или зерцало, пред очи наши Богъ положи, яко да учащеся, от дольныхъ восходимъ на вышняя. Аще же дольнихъ не познаваемъ, то како горняя разумѣти имамы?»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 295.

[185] See John Sadler's translation *Comenius.* Note especially chapter 1, sections 6 "The Concept of Growth" (34–36) and seven "The Concept of Order" (37–38).

sequences to the four-rung sequence of St. John Climacus, the medieval ascetic with whose *Ladder of Divine Ascent* Dymytrii was well-acquainted:

> Some tame passions and become humble, others psalmodise, that is, pray with their lips; yet others practise mental prayer; others rise to contemplation. Those who undertake to climb by these rungs do not begin with the top and then go down, but start from the bottom and go upwards—stepping first on the first rung, then on the second, then on the third and, finally, on the fourth. The method by which he who wishes to raise himself off the earth and rise to heaven is as follows; first he must wrestle with his mind and tame his passions; second he must practise psalmody, that is, pray with the lips, for, when passions are subdued, prayer quite naturally brings sweetness and enjoyment even to the tongue and is accepted by God as pleasing to him; third, he must pray mentally; fourth, he must rise to contemplation. The first is appropriate to beginners; the second, to those who have already achieved some measure of success; the third to those drawing nigh to the last rungs of achievement, and the fourth—to the perfect.[186]

Like any other religious text that utilizes a sequential order, the *Ladder of Divine Ascent* is essentially a spiritual variation on the basic idea of the rhetorical period.[187] Climacus' *Ladder* may indeed have served as an *exemplum* or rhetorical model for Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet;* at the very least it provided Dymytrii with an example of a spiritual program that follows a periodic structure. The idea of spiritual ascent as an orderly sequence, so essential to Climacus is echoed by Dymytrii's notion that spiritual learning must proceed according to the principles of order and sequence.

But a rhetorical model is never copied: a good rhetorician starts with the *exemplum* as a primary source but then creates a new work through his own inventiveness.[188] Dymytrii retains the basic ideas of John's sequence: (1) the subduing of the passions; (2) prayer with the lips; (3) prayer with the mind (4) contemplation. In Dymytrii's approach there is a departure that reveals him to be a modern thinker nurtured in the educational spirit of Erasmus, Comenius, and Loyola. For John the spiritual struggle is against two enemies: the body and the mind. For Dymytrii, however, the struggle is to bring order and harmony to the flesh and to the spirit. For John the mind stands in opposition to the spirit ("first he must wrestle with his mind"); for Dymytrii the soul is the dwelling place of the intellect. The reasoning and understanding faculties of the human being exist within the rational soul. The mind is not the enemy of the soul but the servant of the soul. To struggle against the mind would be to struggle with the soul herself. Like Marsilio Ficino, Dymytrii believes that the true struggle is not against the mind but against the misunderstanding and doubt that undermine the soul's reason. The true enemies of salvation are misunderstanding and doubt, and it is the soul's reasoning faculties that restore and maintain the order and harmony that is natural to the inward human being.

---

[186] *Writings from the Philokalia on Prayer of the Heart*, trans. E. Kadloubovsky and G. Palmer (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1951) 159–160.

[187] We are speaking here of period in the rhetorical sense of a sequential unit: "There follows the question of periodic structure, which involves two things in particular, first arrangement and then rhythm and balance"—Cicero, *De Oratore* 3.43.171 (2:135).

[188] As Quintilian explains, "Imitation alone is not sufficient, if only for the reason that a sluggish nature is only too ready to rest content with the inventions of others. For what would have

Another fundamental difference between Dymytrii and John is the hierarchy established by John among those who pursue spiritual ascent: the second rung, that of prayer with the lips, belongs to those who have achieved some measure of spiritual success; the third rung, that of prayer with the mind, to those approaching the last rungs of achievement; the fourth, that of contemplation, belongs to the spiritually perfect. Such a hierarchy does not exist in Dymytrii's sequence. For Dymytrii all prayer must take place with the lips and with the mind. Prayer that takes place with the lips but without mindful activity accomplishes nothing. The simplest of prayers must be prayed attentively. Here Dymytrii is sharing a position taken by the Spanish Baroque mystic, Teresa of

---

happened in the days when models [*exemplo*] were not, if men had decided to do and think of nothing that they did not know already"—Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. H. Butler (London:Heinemann, 1922) 10.2.4 (4: 77).

Avila. Teresa, like Dymytrii, eschews the medieval distinction between "vocal" and "mental" prayer, maintaining that any prayer without mindful attentiveness is not prayer at all:

> I do not say mental prayer rather than vocal, for if it is prayer at all, it must be accompanied by meditation. If a person does not think whom he is addressing, and what he is asking for, and who it is that is asking and of whom he is asking it, I do not consider that he is praying at all even though he be constantly moving his lips.[189]

Like Teresa, Dymytrii does not reserve John's fourth rung—contemplation—for the spiritually perfect alone. All men and women are called to direct their hearts and minds to God at all times, and all Christians are called to meditate on God's benevolence and to marvel and to take comfort in this.

Still another crucial difference between Dymytrii and John is the absence of the social context in John's four-step sequence. Dymytrii shares Loyola's belief that the human being must play an active and useful role in society. John's four-step sequence unfolds within the private world of the inward person. Dymytrii, along with Comenius and Loyola, emphasizes the importance of good deeds and acts of charity for the spiritual development of the Christian. John's sequence represents the ascetic's desire to free himself from the earth and rise to heaven. Dymytrii's sequence, by contrast, does not permit the Christian to forsake his social obligations on earth. For Dymytrii, as for Loyola and Comenius, the work of salvation is to be done in the world and within a social context. God, he asserts has placed human beings in the world so that his creation can direct them to the path of spiritual wisdom: "God has placed, before our eyes, all the created world and all the worldly composition to serve as a teaching place, or as an exemplary model, so that we should learn how to ascend from lower levels to higher ones." Unlike John's student, who is instructed to flee from the world, Dymytrii's student is told to embrace it and to learn from it. And unlike John, who is addressing a medieval monastic readership, Dymytrii is addressing Early Modern Christians, monastic and secular, who seek inward understanding within a social context. Dymytrii's own life was based on this modern idea that spiritual life and civic responsibility go hand-in-hand. Although Dymytrii's first loyalty was to God's Kingdom, he nonetheless accepted the place that was accorded to him among the courtiers of Baturyn and Moscow.

---

[189] Teresa of Avila, *The Interior Castle (The Mansions)*, trans. E. Allison Peers (London: Sheed and Ward, 1974) 4.

Here we see Dymytrii treating the created world as an *exemplum* or rhetorical model (in Slavonic: *zertsalo* i.e., "mirror"). During the Classical period Quintilian emphasized that the important thing is to understand how a model works and to apply this understanding to one's own rhetorical work.[190] Rhetorical models are everywhere in Dymytrii's sermons: in his Sermon on the Descent of the Holy Spirit he explains that every artisan requires a model or a pattern to follow. Likewise the pious Christian must also seek appropriate models for behavior:

> If one wishes to learn a certain art, he studies an example—he follows a pattern or a form. The painter has his model, the architect his plan.[191]

Dymytrii applies this concept to spiritual learning, explaining that the human soul similarly requires a rhetorical model to follow, and God has provided one in the created world.[192] Specifically, it is the good arrangement and harmonious order of the created world that reveals its Creator and at the same time directs human beings along the path of goodness and virtuous living. Disorder, or sin, belongs to the world in its fallen state. Like Adam's being placed in the garden of Eden as the husbandman, later human beings are given the task of restoring and maintaining the good order and harmony that are natural to the created world. To accomplish this task each human being must become master of his own inner world through the orderly sequence of understanding, humility, good deeds, and prayer.

---

[190] "We must consider the appropriateness with which these orators handle the circumstances and persons involved in the various cases in which they were engaged, and observe the judgement and powers of arrangement which they reveal, and the manner in which everything they say"—Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 10.2.27 (4: 89).

[191] «Хто хочетъ яковаго научитися ремесла, смотритъ на образецъ, на зразъ и на кшталтъ того дѣлаетъ: маляръ маетъ кунштъ предъ собою, а будовичной—абрисъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 13.

[192] I.e., «Того бо ради всю тварь, и все мірское устроеніе, якоже нѣкое училище, или зерцало, пред очи наши Богъ положи, яко да учащеся, от дольныхъ восходимъ на вышняя»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 295.

Order and sequence are fundamental to Dymytrii's *Alphabet.* A grammarian and rhetorician, he understood clearly that children must be taught in such a way that they are not discouraged by difficulties but at the same time are encouraged for mastering assigned tasks.[193] Loyola maintained that pedagogical sequences ensure that children are given tasks to perform only when they are ready for these challenges.[194] By adhering to sequence, a certain momentum is maintained whereby the child can advance to higher levels of proficiency.

Loyola's combination of a highly structured sequential program with certain allowances for each student's individual limitations finds certain resonance in the pedagogical strategies Dymytrii employs for teaching the art of spiritual wisdom to the human soul. Whether Dymytrii speaks of the outward education of the world, or of the inward education of the soul, he sees sequences as the fundamental building blocks of learning. Dymytrii describes how this interior sequence works:

---

[193] Comenius discusses this problem of student motivation in the section entitled "To ensure that men learn everything with pleasure" in his *Pampaedia* 89–90.

[194] Loyola discusses this concept in connection with the practise of spiritual exercises, explaining the basic principle that exercises are not to be assigned indiscriminately, but in accordance with the student's desire to be helped by them (i.e., motivation). See Loyola 203.

> From understanding and knowledge is born faith;
> From faith is born obedience to God's commandments;
> From obedience to God's commandments is born hope in God;
> From hope in God is born divine love.
> [Divine love] becoming multiplied, [man's] union with God becomes complete, and the law and the prophets become fulfilled.[195]

Thus, reason and understanding, endowed to all human beings at the moment they are created, are the primary materials of spiritual living. Of all creatures, it is man and the angels who possess the third and highest soul in the neo-Platonic order—the soul of reason and understanding.[196] The rational soul is given to human beings so that the highest of all goals may be achieved: divine love. This soul gives the human being understanding and knowledge, the two essential ingredients for faith. Understanding and knowledge are acts of reason, faith an act of the imagination. From the sensible and tangible world of reason, the human being proceeds to the invisible and ineffable realm of faith. This step in Dymytrii's sequence underlines the Platonic belief that the sensible world serves only as a stepping stone to the unseen world of the imagination. The tangible world of the senses primarily serves to direct human beings to the invisible world of faith. At the same time, however, the imagination is also dependent upon sensibility. Aristotle saw the soul and its different capacities as intimately connected with and dependent on the body.[197] In his introduction to *De Sensu* he enumerated these dependent functions, including: sensation, memory, reason, desire to satisfy hunger and thirst, feelings of pleasure and pain, sleep and waking, youth and age, respiration and expiration. Aristotle states that it is clear that these phenomena are common to the soul and to the body, "for all of them either are accompanied by sensation or result from it . . . and that sensation is produced in the soul by way of the body can be proved, and is indeed clear without proof."[198] For Aristotle, the qualities of soul, life, and sensory perception were integrally connected. The animate differs from the inanimate by possessing life, and everything that is alive possess at least one of the following qualities: reason, sense-perception, local movement and rest, nutrition, decay and growth.[199] At the same time, however, "being an animal depends on having the quality of perception; even things that cannot move, but have sense-perception, we describe as animals and not merely as living things."[200]

---

[195] «От разума и познанія раждается вѣра, от вѣры же заповѣдей Божіихъ храненіе: от храненія же заповѣдей Божіихъ упованіе на Бога; от упованія же на Бога Божественная любовь: сей же умноженнѣй бывшей, совершенное бываетъ съ Богомъ соединеніе, и исполненіе закона и пророковъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 295.

[196] Concerning the Neoplatonic tripartite soul in the context of seventeenth-century humanism, see the chapter entitled, "Theories of Knowledge and Perception" in H. James Jensen 1–23.

[197] See Vinge 16–21.

An analysis of the five senses and their role in spiritual memory is provided in the fourth chapter of this thesis. However, it is important to note here that sensibility and perception are linked to yet another faculty of the soul: the imagination. As a rhetorician, Dymytrii understands that imagination is the work of memory: to imagine something is to recollect a previous experience. However, people never imagine things in the exact same way that they originally experienced them. Therefore, the soul's imagination must perceive things differently from the body's senses. These are the eyes of the soul to which Dymytrii refers constantly in his sermons and Saints' Lives. These eyes are dependent upon the eyes of the body, and at the same time they perceive those things the body cannot see on its own.

The imaginative work of the soul's eyes, ears, nose, tongue and hands is crucial for salvation, for faith depends upon these sensibilities. The sensibility of the created world affects the human being and his imagination brings him to the recognition and knowledge of his Creator. In this respect, faith is a kind of memory by which the believer recollects his divine origin at the hand of God, and the sensibilities of the created world plays a crucial part in the work of faith.

---

[198] As quoted in Vinge 16. See Aristotle, *De Sensu* 1, 436 b 1.
[199] Vinge, p. 16.
[200] As quoted in Vinge 16. See Aristotle, *De Anima* 2 :2, 413 b 1.

Acquiring faith, in turn, does not release the Christian from his obligations to the sensible world, according to Dymytrii. The next step of his sequence, "from faith is born obedience to God's commandments," underlines the social and moral obligations that accompany true belief. Dymytrii, naturally, is following St. Paul's teaching that faith without good works is nothing: "And though I have all faith, so that I could move mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing" (I Cor. 13.2). However, both Paul and Dymytrii share the conviction that the vocation of Christian living is to be carried out in the present life, in the world that surrounds human beings and the society in which they live. Hence, good deeds and obedience to God's commandments are the natural sequence that follows the imaginative work of believing.[201]

The next step in Dymytrii's sequence returns us to another imaginative state, that of hope: "From obedience to God's commandments is born hope in God; From hope in God is born divine love." Faith and hope are two different things. Both, however, are dependent on the human being's sensibilities. Faith depends on the individual's ability to understand and know the world around him, and hope depends on his ability to interact with the world and with other men in a spirit of love and charity, manifest through his good deeds and obedience to God's commandments. Obedience gives the human being hope. The opposite of hope is despair, which for Dymytrii is the emotional result of disobedience—the absence of charity and love in one's dealings with the world.

---

[201] See chapter three, "*Dispositio Spiritualis.*"

By living a kind and virtuous life the human being receives the gift of hope in God. In turn, the gift of hope leads to the greatest gift of all, that of Divine love. Love for other men through good deeds, through the medium of hope in God, leads to the highest love of all. Divine love being multiplied, the individual finds complete union with God, and the law and the prophets become fulfilled:

> For as much as blossoms understanding,
> so much flourishes faith.
> For as much flourishes faith,
> so much multiplies good deeds,
> and so much is generated hope in God.
> And for as much as a person hopes,
> so much he loves God.
> And for as much as he loves [God].
> so much he unites with him.
> And as much as he unites with God,
> he enjoys the fruits of Divine glory.[202]

Good deeds play a central role in the sequence above. Understanding leads to faith, and faith leads to good deeds. From good deeds is generated hope, and from hope comes love. Dymytrii starts with the three "Divine Virtues" listed in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians.[203] He has placed understanding at the threshold of the three "Divine Virtues" and inserted good deeds as the central tie that holds faith, hope, and love together. Above all else Dymytrii's sequence is founded on scripture, but it operates according to a humanist model, based on intellectual understanding and embodied by corporal acts of charity. Dymytrii's sequence agrees with Loyola's fundamental belief that an educational program must motivate the student to contribute to society and to participate fully in public life. Dymytrii's emphasis on good works underlines the importance of the social context that Loyola considered essential for Christian living. Acts of charity serve as the basis of Christian ethics, an so in Dymytrii's *Alphabet* good works are situated at the very center of the sequence that moves the student along the course of spiritual development.

---

[202] «По елику процвѣтаетъ разумъ,
по толику возрастаетъ и вѣра,
и по елику возрастаетъ вѣра,
по толику умножаются добродѣтели,
по толику раждается и упованіе на Бога.
И по елику кто уповаетъ,
по толику и Бога любитъ,
и по елику любитъ,
по толику и съ Богомъ соединяется,
насладжающися Божественныя его славы»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 295.

[203] 1 Cor. 13.13. Paul himself is offering his own sequence in which the third, final, and greatest of these three virtues is love. In Slavonic the text reads: «Нынѣ же пребываютъ, вѣра, надежа, любы, трое сіе; больши же сихъ, любы» In the Authorized (King James) Version: "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."

As with all pedagogical sequences, however, the reverse sequence is also possible. Dymytrii warns of this, and explains that just as understanding and knowledge constitute the beginning of a fruitful and virtuous life, misunderstanding produces the beginning of all unhappiness. As good deeds move the Christian along the path of Divine love and hope, disobedience to the Lord's commandments drives him to despair:

> From misunderstanding is born doubt,
> from doubt [is born] disobedience,
> from disobedience [is born] all sin and transgression.
> How can one believe, when he understands nothing? Not believing, nor understanding anything, how can he keep the Lord's commandments? Not keeping the Lord's commandments, how can he have hope in God and love? In no way.[204]

The reverse sequence above has implications for Dymytrii's sermons on the subject of spiritual healing.[205] According to Dymytrii the unhappy, tormented soul exists in a sinful state that is the direct consequence of a misunderstanding. Knowing and recognizing that one has misunderstood something is the first step to spiritual healing. Misunderstanding is a human weakness, but, like all man's weaknesses, it may be overcome. The human being is naturally endowed with reason, and in Dymytrii's sermons that deal with the healing of the troubled soul, Jesus' healing restores the natural order and understanding of the inward man or woman. By knowing that which has not been understood, the human being's reason returns him to the path of faith, good deeds, hope and Divine love:

---

[204] «От безумія раждается невѣріе,
от невѣрія же преслушаніе,
от преслушанія же всякъ грѣхъ и преступленіе.
Како кто можетъ вѣровати, ничтоже разумѣяй; не вѣруяй же, ниже разумѣяй ничтоже, како можетъ сохраняти Господни заповѣди;
не сохраняяй же Господни заповѣди, како можетъ имѣти на Бога упованіе, и любовь: Никакоже»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 296.

[205] See chapter three, "*Dispositio Spiritualis.*"

> For this reason, before all else, it is proper to learn, not just outward labor, but the activity of the mind, understanding, and knowledge. He who has learned understanding, and all the knowledge of all things, is then ready to accept faith, and to keep all the Lord's commandments, and to hope in God, and to love him with all his heart, and to unite with him as one; within him everything shall be as in God, and God in him. Such a man, before the resurrection, will receive the resurrection of the soul, and before life [eternal], he will inherit eternal life. The silence of death is consumed in the understanding and knowledge of life. For it is said, this is life eternal, to know the Lord; and this is death, to understand him not.[206]

Dymytrii notes a five-step sequence to:

(1) Acquire knowledge and understanding of all things;

(2) Accept faith;

(3) Keep God's commandments;

---

[206] «Тѣмже прежде всего подобаетъ учитися, не точію внѣшнему труду, но и дѣланію умному, разумомъ и позанію, и научивыйся кто разуму, и всѣхъ вещей познанію, удобнѣ всему вѣру емлетъ, сохраняетъ вся Господи заповѣди, уповаетъ на Бога, любитъ его всѣмъ сердцемъ своимъ, и соединяется съ нимъ во едино, во еже быти ему всему въ Бозѣ, и Богу въ немъ. Сицевый прежде воскресенія, воскресеніе души пріемлетъ, и прежде жизни, жизнь вѣчную наслѣдуетъ, во еже пожертой быти безсловесія смерти, разума и познанія жизнію: се бо, рече, есть животъ вѣчный, да познаемъ Господа, се же и смерть, не разумѣти о немъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 296.

(4) Accept hope in God;

(5) Love God and Unite with him in eternal life.

These five steps reflect the active and passive learning processes that are requisite to the soul's education; similarly, Ignatius Loyola recognized the roles played by both active and passive learning processes in childhood development. By passive learning he meant the child's ability to learn without conscious effort, as compared to educational activities in which goals and strategies are clearly pursued. Dymytrii's steps one and three—knowledge acquisition and good behavior—are activities that human beings must actively pursue. To acquire knowledge of all things Christians must participate in some sort of activity that teaches them about surrounding world. They do this either through their own observation, or by learning from the experience of others through books, lessons and the examples of others. Step three—obedience to God's commandments—likewise requires active participation. Christians must perform good deeds and refrain from evil ones—good behavior is a "hands-on" learning experience. Acts of love and charity cannot be done through the intellect alone.

The other type of learning, passive learning, is revealed in steps two and four: the acceptance of faith and hope, respectively. Faith is a gift; Christians cannot actively pursue it. They must pray for faith, and it is given to them according to God's will. Likewise hope is elusive to those who seek it. In their prayers, men and women must beseech God for the gift of hope, and it shall given to them accordingly. Thus, in Dymytrii's five-step sequence, two crucial steps in the soul's development come not from the Christian's own personal resourcefulness, but from his willingness to accept that which God offers him. In this respect the soul's reception of faith and hope is a passive process:

Christians must accept these gifts in the same way that a child accepts and trusts the good judgement and benevolence of his elders.

The fifth step of the process—to love God and unite with him in faith—represents the cooperative process in the soul's education. The act of love is both active and passive: Christians must actively love God, and they must allow themselves to be filled by God's love. It is by a loving, responsive relationship with God that the silence of death is transformed into the knowledge of life. The ignorance and misunderstanding of the human being's fallen state becomes transformed into the wisdom and understanding of eternal life. In this manner, interior wisdom is the final result of the sequence that began with the first step of spiritual inventiveness.

As the rhetorician looks at all things as potential sources of invention, Dymytrii likewise sees all things in the world as material for the soul to use in the arrangement of a virtuous life:

> Mindful activity, by which we draw near to the Lord and complete our union with him, is the following: to know first all the created world, visible and comprehensible, from whom and why it was created, how it is ordered and composed, and to truly find faith in this. And in the same manner, [to know] oneself, and all the mysteries that are within oneself, and all of his [God's] good deeds.[207]

Dymytrii emphasizes mindful *activity:* the passive mind falls away and becomes alienated from God. Knowledge of God, knowledge of the universe, and knowledge of the self are interrelated and must be actively pursued together. These three kinds of knowledge—of God, of the world, and of the self— share a common goal, that of moving the human being to faith. For this reason God did not create the universe simply for man's pleasure, nor simply for his intellectual delight, but so that human being should read the invisible mysteries inscribed upon the universe, and having understood these mysteries in their souls, he may unite himself with God in faith and love.

---

[207] «Дѣланіе умное, имже имамы приближитися, и совершенно присоединитися Господеви, сіе есть: еже познати первѣе всю тварь видимую и разумѣваемую, от кого, и чесо ради сотворена бысть, и камо движима, и обращаема есть, и увѣритися о семъ истинно, таже себе, и все еже о себѣ таинство, таже и вся его благодѣанія»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 299.

Knowledge of the universe is a two-step process, according to Dymytrii. The first step is discovery, the second reflection:

> Therefore, I say, understanding of rightness and truth are found in this: the knowledge of all things in detail, such that not a single thing is left concealed and not reflected upon, and to immerse oneself in this for a long time, so that one may be with him as one grown together, as one united.[208]

Again Dymytrii is following the rhetorician's need to reflect upon his knowledge before selecting the various items that will be used to fashion his oration. Cicero makes it clear that inventive sources are not to be pulled out haphazardly, but with careful consideration and deliberate selection. As a good rhetorician considers all things carefully and reflects upon them at length, so the student of spiritual living requires time to examine the world, and to immerse himself in the knowledge and reflection of all things. Once he has learned from the world, he is then ready to know himself and to know God.

To this end Dymytrii offers some practical advice regarding sources, directing his readers to the "Sedmodnevnyk":

> For this reason, if someone wishes to properly come to the knowledge of the created world, and to the knowledge of his self, and of the Lord, let him frequently read that little book, entitled "The Seven Days (*Sedmodnevnyk*)" in which we have described this fully.[209]

---

[208] «Ово, глаголю, разумъ правъ и истиненъ есть, познати вся сія подробну, во еже ни единой вещи въ него утаеннѣй, и недоумѣннѣй быти, и углубити же въ себе долгимъ временемъ, во еже быти ему съ симъ, яко единосраслену, и во едино соединену»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 299.

[209] «Обаче хотяй кто удобнѣе пріити въ познаніе твари, въ познаніе себе, таже и Господа, да четь найчастѣе книжицу, нареченную Седмодневникъ,

Dymytrii's reference to the seven days of the creation account reinforces his fundamental belief that God's act of creating serves as the divine model upon which the art of rhetoric is based. If Christians study the created world attentively, they will acquire the understanding of such concepts as order, sequence, division, proportion, balance—the fundamental principles that constitute rhetorical *dispositio*. Having observed and understood these principles in the visible world, they must then turn this knowledge inward, and apply them to the invisible task of arranging their souls in a manner pleasing to God. Only after they have cultivated the harmonious disposition of a loving and faithful Christian are they able to know God truly.

Of course, Dymytrii makes clear that knowledge of the self is one kind of knowledge, while knowledge of God is of a different sort. Knowledge of the created world and of the self share a common nature in the object: human beings themselves were created by the hand of God, just as the world that surrounds them was. God, on the other hand, is uncreated and transcendent. Knowledge of him is knowledge of the ineffable and unknowable. Knowledge of the self, like all knowledge of created things, is a two-step process based on examination and reflection. Knowledge of God, according to Dymytrii, results from a three-step sequence:

1. knowledge of the created world (познанiе твари)
2. knowledge of the self (познанiе себе)
3. knowledge of the Lord (познанiе Господа).

въ немже о семъ пространнѣе начертахомъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 299. The identity of the book in question, *Sedmodnevnyk* (literally, "Seven Days"), can only be guessed. No such work is mentioned by Shliapkin in his list of Dymytrii's library books, nor does Dymytrii speak of it elsewhere. In Dymytrii's time the most widely read expositions concerning the first week of Creation were the *Exameron* of St. Ambrose of Milan and the *Hexaemeron* of St. Basil the Great. A connection between Ambrose's text and Cicero's *De Natura Deorum* in regard to the role played by Divine providence in the arrangement of man and of the universe has been suggested by Louise Vinge (Vinge 37).

In this manner, the *discipulus spiritualis* moves in the correct pedagogical order: he begins from the lower place (the knowledge that surrounds him); he then moves to a higher place (the invisible knowledge within him); and finally he moves to the highest and most desirable place: the utterly unknowable knowledge of God.

Doubtless there are Christological and Trinitarian implications in Dymytrii's use of the numbers two and three. An Orthodox Christian, Dymytrii believed that Jesus Christ possessed two natures, human and divine. He also believed that all human beings are composed of two elements, body and soul. And the human soul bears the three-fold nature assigned to her initially by Plato and later by Christian theologians, beginning with St. Paul's distinction between soul and the spirit—the animative and reasoning faculties of the inward human being, respectively.[210] Thus, the three-step sequence that leads to the knowledge of God is a labor of mutual love and respect involving all three aspects of the inward human being's existence: the physical, the animative and the spiritual self.

Like that of St. Paul, Dymytrii's understanding of the lowest level of the inward person—the vegetative soul—does not receive the attention that is given to the two higher levels, the animative soul and reasoning spirit. Most likely Dymytrii, like Paul, takes this lowest aspect of the inward person—the *zoe* of the New Testament—as a given, since by definition all living things possess the spirit of life.[211] As in St. Paul's writing, the life principle is present everywhere in

---

[210] The vegetative soul, in Greek *zoe* is referred to throughout St. Paul's Epistles. The translation of this word in the Authorized (King James) Version is "life."

[211] Strong gives the following, concise definition for the word *psyche* and its relationship to *pneuma*:

> psyche: from *breath*, i.e. (by implication) *spirit* , abstract or concrete (the *animal* sentient principle only; thus distinguished from *pneuma*, which is the rational and immortal *soul*; and on the other hand from *zoe* , which is mere *vitality*, even of plants: these terms thus exactly correspond respectively to the Hebrew *nephesh*, *rûwach*, and *chay*). From: James Strong, *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon P, 1983) 79

Dymytrii's work, for without life the spirit does not flourish. From the moment that a child becomes animate in his mother's womb, the work of the soul begins.[212] The human being's spiritual labor is completed in the world to come, after the soul and body are restored to life on Judgement Day. Thus, for Dymytrii as for any other Christian philosopher, the *zoe* principle is the beginning and the end of all spiritual experience.

For Dymytrii the knowledge of the self, the knowledge of the surrounding world, and the knowledge of God all take place according to a three-step sequence involving all three aspects of the inward human being's existence: the physical, the animative and the spiritual self. Spiritual knowledge requires the engagement of the the soul's animative and reasoning faculties, and appropriate action on the part of the body. A pedagogue, Dymytrii is keenly interested in the *process* involved in the acquisition of wisdom—that is, it is the steps that the spiritual learner must follow in order to succeed in his or her task of spiritual invention. By briefly examining one his well-known narratives, his Life of St. Barbara, we may see the role that these sequences play according to Dymytrii in the enlightenment of the inward human being.

Dymytrii's Tale of Spiritual Inventiveness: the Life of St. Barbara

An illustration of spiritual inventiveness is found in Dymytrii's St. Barbara story from his *Reading Menaea*. Barbara, a pagan girl, is secluded in a tower to protect her innocence by her father, Dioscorus. It is her own ability to reason, however, that moves her to question her father's pagan beliefs and to seek her own answers to the mysteries of life. But also essential to the Barbara story is that the answers to her questions do not come from her own intellect but from the faith of others. For Dymytrii reason and judgement are useful as instruments along the path to spiritual understanding. True inward wisdom, however, comes from the Holy Spirit. What is more, a social context is essential for Christian living. Barbara lives alone in a cell, and it is only when she leaves her tower and makes contact with other people that she receives wisdom. Her evolution moves in three steps: (1) her reasoning leads to doubt and questioning; (2) the Holy Spirit sets her afire with a desire to know God; (3) she receives the Gospel from other Christians.

---

[212] The Slavonic equivalent for the Greek *zoe* used in the Ostroh Bible is *zhyvot* ("life"). For example, the Slavonic text of 1 Tim. 4.8 «тѣлесное бо обученіе, въ малѣ есть полезно, а благочестіе, на все полезно есть, обѣтованіе имѣя живота нинѣшняго и грядущаго» ("For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life [*zoe*] that now is, and of that which is to come").

Dymytrii's own inventive sources must have included a combination of Greek, Latin and Slavonic hagiographic works. One major source that Dymytrii could not have used for this particular saint's life was the Bollandists' *Acta Sanctorum*. The Bollandists published each monthly volume of their hagiographic series according to the calendar year starting in January. Like everyone else, Dymytrii could purchase volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum* only as they became available on the book market. As St. Barbara's feast occurs on December 4, and the Bollandists' volume for the month of December had not yet been published during Dymytrii's lifetime (to this day it still awaits completion), he never saw this particular version of St. Barbara's Life. One Latin source that Dymytrii does appear to have consulted, however, is the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine, noted below.

Like Voragine's version, Dymytrii's retelling of the St. Barbara story is one of spiritual alchemy: that of a pagan becoming a Christian. In Dymytrii's re-telling of this story, three things occur that effect this alchemy: (1) Barbara observes the world around her; (2) she begins to reason, her reason leads to doubt, and her doubt moves her to seek answers; (3) a community of Christians intervenes and provides her with spiritual direction.

At the beginning of Dymytrii's story one finds Barbara closed up in her tower, at the order of her father, whose love has moved him to seclude her from the gaze of crude men. Barbara's mother is deceased, and her father is often away. She has no contact with others, save the servant woman, who is her companion and attendant. In Barbara's tower, the following scene unfolds:

> Once, as she was gazing at the heavens, and beholding the sunshine, and the orbit of the moon, and the beauty of the stars, she said to her governess and servant who lived with her: "Who created this? And who created the earth's beauty: the delightful fields and orchards, and the gardens, and the hills, and the running waters"; she asked: "Whose hand created all this?" The woman standing before her answered: "All these things were created by the gods." Then the maiden asked: "Which gods?" Replied the servant: "The very gods whom your father honors, and keeps in his palace. He worships these gods of gold and silver and wood. These gods created everything that you see with your eyes."[213]

This passage, and the one that immediately follows, compares to the beginning section of Jacobus de Voragine's Life of St. Barbara in the *Legenda aurea*.[214] In both hagiographic works the first step of Barbara's conversion is her observation of the world around her. This first step is essentially a process of rhetorical invention. The good rhetorician gathers as much information as possible before beginning the task of actual composition. Ioanykii Galiatovsky, rector of the Kyiv Collegium and professor of rhetoric during Dymytrii's own student years, himself advised young rhetoricians to utilize a wide selection of inventive resources before preparing a speech:

---

[213] «Единою же взирающи на небо, и разсмотрѣвающи солнечное сіяніе, теченіе лунное, и украшеніе звѣздное, рече къ сожителствующимъ ей пѣстунница и рабынямъ: кто сія сотвори такожде на красоту земную, на злачныи поля и сады, и вертограды, на горы же и воды ворѣвшии, вопрошаше: чія рука созда вся сія. Предстоящіяже ей рѣша: вся та создаша бози. Вопроси Дѣвица: коротыи бози? Отвѣщаша ей рабынѣ: бози тыи ихже отецъ твой почитаетъ, и держитъ я въ полатѣ своей, златыяже и сребряныя, и древяныя, и покланяется имъ, тыи бози создаша вся я же очими зриши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Cheti-Minei* (Kyiv, 1695) 2: fol. 4b, verso.

[214] "Erat autem beata Barbara ingeniosa et a tenera aetate vanas cogitationes relinquens coepit divina cogitare. Cum enim semel templum intraret, videns simulacra parentibus suis ait: quid sibi volunt hae similitudines hominum? Respondent parentes: taceas, non hominum, sed Deorum sunt et volunt adorari per illud, quod nescitur et quod non videtur. Barbara dixit: fureunt quondam homines, quos nunc colimus? Respondent: ita. Ex hoc beata Barbara die noctuque replicabat tacita dicens: si homines fuerunt Dii nostri, ergo nati sunt ut homines, mortui sunt ut homines: si Dii essent, nec nati fuissnet nec mortui, quia deitas, ut mihi videtur, nec coepit nec desinit esse. Homo etiam habet originem terrae, quia terra est materia ejus, si ergo homo de terra est et homo Deus est, ergo aliquid praecessit eum, quod ejus origo dicitur; sic aptius dicerem terram Deum. Sed quia nec terra a se est nec coelum a se nec aër a se nec aqua a se, ex quibus quator elementis constat homo sed creaturae sunt, necesse est his esse creatorem. Ecce quanta

> It is necessary to read the Bible, the Lives of the Saints. It is necessary to read the Church teachers: Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, John Chrysostom, Athanasius Theodorite, John Damascene, Ephrem and other Church teachers who explain the holy writings of the Bible. It is necessary to read histories and chronicles about various domains and lands, about what happened there and what today takes place there. It is necessary to read books about animals, birds, serpents, fish, trees, flowers, stones and the various waters, those that are found in the sea, in rivers, in wells, and in other places. [It is necessary] to observe and take note of their nature, their properties and effects, and to apply them to the speech that you wish to compose.[215]

Flexibility in choosing sources of invention is also advocated by Dymytrii's own close friend and colleague, Stefan Iavorsky, in his manual for rhetoric, entitled *The Rhetorical Hand* (*Ritoricheskaia ruka*).[216] Iavorsky explains that the first finger of the rhetorical hand is the thumb, representing *inventio* (Slav:

---

sapienta in tam juvenili puella"—Jacobus de Voragine, *Jacobi a Voragine Legenda aurea vulgo Historia lombardica dicta* [*Legenda aurea*] (Osnabruck: Otto Zeller, 1965) 898.

[215] «Треба читати быблѣю, животы святыхъ, треба читати учителей церковныхъ—Василія Великаго, Григорія Богослова, Іоанна Златоустаго, Аѳанасіа Ѳеодорита, Іоанна Дамаскина, Ефрема и иншихъ учителей церковныхъ, которыи писмо святое въ библіи толкуютъ, треба читати гисторіи и кройники о розмаитыхъ панствахъ и сторонахъ, що ся въ нихъ дѣяло и теперъ що ся дѣетъ, треба читати книги о звѣрох, птахахъ, гадахъ, рыбахъ, деревахъ, зѣлахъ, камѣняхъ и розмаитыхъ водахъ, которыи въ морю, въ рѣкахъ, въ студняхъ и на иншихъ мѣстцяхъ знайдуются, и уважати ихъ натуру, власности и скутки и тое собѣ нотовати и апплѣковати до свое речи, которую повѣдати хочешъ»—Ioanykii Galiatovs'kyi, *Kliuch razuminiia* (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1985) 220.

[216] Published in *Izdanie Obshchestva Liubitelei Drevnei Pis'mennosti* (St. Petersburg, 1878) 20: 1–104.

izobretenie). The rhetorical thumb of inventiveness possess a special property, for it has the ability to bend.[217] Hence, rhetorical invention depends on intellectual flexibility and the ability to grasp new ideas. Like Dymytrii, Iavorsky also points out the two levels of rhetorical inventiveness, the first based on outward knowledge, the second on inward knowledge.[218]

Like the God to whom she turns, Dymytrii's St. Barbara is a skillful rhetorician. The text that she is arranging is her own soul. Barbara's source of invention is the world around her; she finds her rhetorical sources in "reading" the cosmos. In the Christian tradition the idea of the created world as the equivalent of written text is not without precedent: St. Anthony of Egypt forsook books and declared God's wisdom to be written on the desert hills. Dymytrii's St. Barbara reads the world around her, and her reading leads her to an awareness of the incongruity between the message given to her by the created world and the pagan teachings of her father, communicated by the servant. This awareness leads to doubt:

> Upon hearing these words, the girl became filled with doubt, and said to herself: "These gods that my father honors were created by the hands of men. The goldsmith created the gold and silver ones, the stonecutter created the stone ones, the woodworker created the wooden ones. How is it possible that these created gods created the most brilliant heavenly heights and this earthly beauty, when they themselves are unable to walk with their feet, nor do things with their hands?"
>
> In this manner she absorbed herself in thought, day and night often gazing into the heavens. And from the created world, she began to know the Creator.[219]

---

[217] «В риторичестѣи руцѣ вси персти имѣютъ нѣчто особное. Перстъ великой можетъ склою»—Iavors'kyi 11.

[218] «Изобрѣтеніе бываетъ сугубо чрезъ мѣста внутренняя и чрезъ мѣста внѣшняя»—Iavors'kyi 12.

[219] «Дѣвица же слышащи тыя глаголы ихъ, усумнѣвашеся, и сама въ севѣ вѣщаше: бози ихъ же отецъ мой почитаетъ, созданы суть руками человѣческами: златыя и сребряныя созда златаръ, каменныя созда каменосѣчецъ, древяныя созда древодѣль. Како убо тыи созданныи бози возмогоша создати толикую пресвѣтлую высоту небесную, и сицевую

Doubt plays a major role in Barbara's spiritual transformation. In Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* doubt plays a pivotal role in another kind of alchemy, that of understanding and virtue being transformed into disobedience and sin. But in St. Barbara's story, the doubt that troubles Barbara, on the contrary, leads to her spiritual rebirth. Her own reason leads her to conclude that the teachings of her father's religion cannot be true. Troubled by this realization, Barbara becomes absorbed in her thoughts and returns to her cosmic reading. Like an astronomer, she spends day and night gazing at the heavens, a close reading of the text provided by the tangible world which moves her toward the most important knowledge of all: her Creator.

Note Barbara's internal dialogue. Dymytrii's characters often speak to themselves in a rhetorical apostrophe directed to the inward self. In his sermons he frequently apostrophizes to the saints, engaging them in rhetorical dialogues. The outward skill of the rhetorician addressing persons not present in the room becomes an internalized skill in Dymytrii approach to spiritual understanding. In the St. Barbara story, the hero speaks to her soul in an inward apostrophe and engages her soul in an inward dialogue. Whether we speak of outward apostrophe of the rhetorician, or the inward dialogue of the soul, the result is the same: the one whom we address enters into our awareness. Acquiring this kind of awareness through inward dialogue forms an essential part of Dymytrii's *Alphabet*.

Spiritual understanding, however, cannot be acquired though one's own intellect. For this acquisition to occur other minds must become involved via two

---

красоту земную, сами немогуще ни ходити ногами, ни дѣлати руками? Тако въ севѣ помышляющи, взыраше часто къ небеси въ дни и въ нощи, и отъ созданія Создателя увѣдати тщашеся»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Cheti-Minei* (Kyiv, 1695) 2: fol. 4b, verso.

kinds of intervention: (1) divine intervention by God; (2) human intervention by society. Both these elements, divine and human, are essential if the alchemy of the soul is to occur. In Dymytrii's St. Barbara story, divine intervention indeed marks the turning point of the hero's spiritual transformation:

> On one occasion, having gazed at the heavens for a long time, she was possessed with a great desire to know who created these divinely beautiful heights and spheres and the heavenly light. Suddenly in her heart there shone forth the light of Divine grace, and the eyes of her mind were opened and she recognized the one, invisible, ineffable, and unfathomable God who created heaven and earth most wisely.[220]

The result of Barbara's extensive reading of the heavens is that she becomes possessed with a desire for knowledge. Barbara's desire opens her up to God's Spirit in an erotic interplay between the human soul and Divine wisdom: she must first long for the knowledge of God before he can fill her with spiritual understanding. Barbara must first desire God's wisdom before she can surrender to it. By surrendering to God's grace, she allows herself to become a receptacle of his divine wisdom.

The lengthy process by which Barbara studies the cosmos contrasts sharply with the suddenness by which Divine grace enters her. Up to this point, Barbara has been an active participant in her intellectual and spiritual journey. God's grace, however, acts suddenly. Barbara no longer is the active participant, but the passive one. For Dymytrii, wisdom is not to be found in intellectual seeking but in the process of surrendering to Divine grace. Wisdom is acquired through a change in dynamic from the outward seeking of the human intellect to the inward receptiveness of the soul to God's wisdom. Only by surrendering to a passive role can the human soul become truly filled with knowledge.

---

[220] «Единоюже ей долго на небо смотрящей и желанiемъ велiимъ одержимой бывшей, еже знати кто сотвори благолѣпную ту высоту, и пространство, и свѣтѣнiе небесное: внезаапу восiя въ сердци ея Божественныя Благодати Свѣтъ, и отверзе ея умныя очеса, ко познанiю единаго невидимаго недовѣдомаго, и непостыжимаго Бога, небо и землю премудрѣ Создавшаго»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Cheti-Minei* 2: fol. 4b, verso.

The internal dynamic of Barbara's spiritual transformation is reflected in the language that Dymytrii uses to describe it. It is in her heart, not in her intellect, that the light of Divine grace shines forth. Her intellect is changed: the outward seeking of knowledge characterizing her earlier way of thinking is changed into an inward perspective. Dymytrii uses the phrase "the eyes of her mind" to describe Barbara's new awareness. The mind's eyes, naturally, are invisible. The wisdom that Barbara now sees is likewise invisible: it is the recognition of the one, invisible, ineffable and unfathomable God.

Having received inward cognition of the invisible and unfathomable, Barbara resumes her inward dialogue:

> And she said to herself: "There can be only one such God. The human hand did not fashion him, but rather, he possess his own creation, and with his own hand he fashioned everything. He alone has created the spacious heavenly expanse, and the earthy firmament, and himself illumines the universe with the rays of the sun, and the shining of the moon, and the light of the stars. And below he adorns the earth with trees and flowers of many kinds, and gives forth the rivers and springs of water. There can only be one such God who contains everything, who orders everything, and gives everything life, and provides for all."[221]

In this passage Dymytrii describes how Barbara receives a sudden insight into the nature of God, whose oneness is revealed to her. Also, Barbara comes to understand God as a creator and arranger—a rhetorician—of the cosmos. As the orator fashions his speech out of words, so God fashions the universe in an orderly and delightful manner. The created world contains the two essential qualities of good rhetoric: orderly disposition and pleasing adornment. For Dymytrii, the art of rhetoric is but a reflection of the natural beauty and proper arrangement of the created world.

---

[221] «. . . и глаголаше въ себѣ: единъ иматъ быти таковый Богъ, егоже незиждетъ рука человѣческая. но онъ самъ иматъ бытіе свое, и вся Рукою своею созидаетъ. Единъ иматъ быти иже простре широту Небесную, основа тяготу земную, и просвѣщаетъ свышше всю вселенную лучами солнечными, сіянемъ луннымъ, и звѣзднымъ свѣтѣніемъ: долѣже украшаетъ землю древесы и цвѣти различными, и напаяетъ ю рѣками и источники водными. Единъ иматъ быти таковый Богъ, иже вся содержитъ, вся устраяетъ, вся оживляетъ, и о всѣхъ промышляетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Cheti-Minei* 2: fol. 4b, verso.

This understanding of the physical world as a reflection of a higher order originates in Plato. Dymytrii's neo-Platonism, however, is based on a Christian understanding of Platonic forms. Material forms do not just passively represent invisible realities; they in fact move the human being toward salvation. Barbara's tower does not isolate her from the world; rather, it permits her a vantage point from which she observes the universe. Here Dymytrii is not just speaking of physical observation towers but of spiritual ones. Barbara's tower metaphorically represents the need for perspicacity when seeking inward wisdom. Rather than fleeing from the physical world, Barbara observes it closely and intently, and she embraces the sublime lessons that the created world offers. It is Barbara's intellectual vision, her acute discernment, that prepares her soul to receive Divine love and wisdom.

The kindling of Divine love in Barbara's heart moves her with intense desire to know God. Barbara's spiritual hunger is erotic in its desire to know God completely. Like a woman longing for her lover, Barbara's heart burns hot with desire. Day and night she longs for God. She knows no rest, and her mind will not cease with her desire to know one thing only: the knowledge of her God and creator:

> In this way the young woman Barbara learned to know the Creator by means of his creation. For upon her it was according to the words of David: "I learned according to all Your deeds, according to the works of Your hand I did learn" (Ps. 143.5). In this lesson of

> hers, the fire of Divine Love was ignited in her heart, and her soul burned with the flame of desire for God, such a desire that day and night she had no rest. She meditated upon this one thing only, she desired this one thing: to consciously know the God and Creator of all things. It was impossible for her to have had a teacher from among men, a teacher to reveal to her all the mysteries of the holy faith and to set her on the path of salvation. Impossible because her father Dioscorus had placed her under a strict guard, allowing no one to visit her other that the appointed servants. For this reason, the most wise teacher and preceptor, the Holy Spirit himself, according to his inner Grace, taught her unseen, by means of mystical inspiration. And the knowledge of truth became quick in her mind.[222]

Barbara's burning desire to know God can be fulfilled only through the intervention of the Holy Spirit. As Dymytrii emphasizes in his *Alphabet*, the Holy Spirit is the source of all wisdom, both outward and inward:

> The Holy Spirit is the source of all wisdom and understanding, if one receives him [the Holy Spirit], he will be able to understand and know all things interior and exterior.[223]

Lacking a human teacher, Barbara receives her spiritual instruction directly from the Holy Spirit himself. For Dymytrii the role of a teacher as an intermediate one, connecting the individual student with the wisdom that proceeds from God. Because instructors are only instruments of wisdom, and not the source of wisdom themselves, it is possible to acquire understanding without them. The most wise teacher and preceptor of all is the Holy Spirit himself, and all knowledge proceeds through him. Barbara's inward understanding, like all understanding, is a gift bestowed according to the inner grace of the Holy Spirit. The invisible third person of the Trinity teaches Barbara unseen, by means of mystical inspiration. In this manner Barbara receives her inward wisdom through the most direct manner possible, and the knowledge of truth becomes quick in her mind.

---

[222] «Тако отроковица Варвара, отъ твари Творца познавати учашеся, яко собиватися на ней словесамъ Давидовымъ: Поучихся въ всѣхъ дѣлехъ твоихъ, въ твореніихъ Руку твоею поучахся. Въ томъ поученіи ея, разгорѣся въ сердцу ея огнь Любве Божественныя, и распали душу ея пламенемъ желанія Бога, яко неимѣти ей покоя день и нощъ, о томъ единомъ мыслящи, того единаго желающи, еже увѣдати извѣстно Бога и Содѣтеля всяческихъ. Неможаше же имѣти никоего отъ человѣкъ учителя, иже бы открылъ ей таинства святыя Вѣры, и на путь спасенія наставилъ: невозможно бо бѣ никомуже приходити къ ней кромѣ приставленыхъ рабынь, яко родитель ея Діоскоръ, крѣпкую о ней имъ стражу. Обаче самъ Премудрѣйшій Учитель и Наставникъ Духъ Святый, тайнимъ Благодати своея внутръ вдохновеніемъ учаше ю невидомо, и дѣствоваше въ умѣ ея познаніе Правды»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Cheti-Minei* 2: fol. 4b, recto. The Authorized (King James) Version of Ps. 143.5 reads: "I meditate on all thy works; I muse on the work of thy hands." Here Dymytrii is using a Slavonic Bible translation other than the Ostrih, as the Ostrih Bible reads differently: «Поучихся въ всѣхъ дѣлехъ твоихъ и в дѣлехъ руку твоею поучахся.»

[223] «Духъ Святый есть источникъ всякія премудрости и разума: получивый его кто, вся внутренняя и внѣшняя разумѣти и познати можетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 303.

The notion that mystical inspiration (Slavonic: *tainym" vdokhnoveniem"*) is the instrument by which the Holy Spirit's grace bestows wisdom reinforces two ideas fundamental to Dymytrii's program for inward learning. First, wisdom is above all else a mystery because its source, the Holy Trinity, is itself an unknowable and unfathomable mystery. Second, the acquisition of understanding depends upon a passive reception. Both the Latin-derived English "inspiration" (from *inspirare*) and the Slavonic *vdokhnoveniem* are etymologically based upon the word "to breathe." To acquire unknowable wisdom it is necessary that the students open themselves up, and permit themselves to be filled with God's Spirit. Those who actively seek wisdom will not find it, for it cannot be sought after. True inward understanding can be received only as a gift from God. According to Dymytrii wisdom is like the air that human beings breathe, and to be filled with knowledge Christians need only open their hearts and receive it. Another of Dymytrii's texts, "The inner man in the chamber of his heart in solitude learns and prays in secret,"[224] illustrates this concept:

---

[224] «Внутренній человѣкъ въ клѣти сердца своего уединенъ поучающся и молящися втайнѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 144–55.

> And education is of a two-fold nature: outward education in books, inward education in divine meditation; outward education in philosophy, inward education in love of God; outward education in eloquence, inward education in prayer; outward education in the acumen of the mind, inward education in the warmness of the spirit; outward education in artistry, inward education in meditation; outward knowledge puffs one up (I Cor. 8.1), inward wisdom makes one humble; outward knowledge inquires diligently, attempting to understand all things; inward knowledge reflects upon itself and desires to know nothing, only God. In the Psalms of David is thus said to him: "[when thou saidst] Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek" (Ps. 27.8). And again: "As the deer desires the water springs, so does my soul desire you, O God" (Ps. 42.1).[225]

Dymytrii's understanding of wisdom and truth is very much in the spirit of Augustine's own rhetoric, based on the notion that "in silence is truth" (*in silentio veritas*)[226] and in the biblical injunction, "Be still, and know that I am God" (Ps. 46.10). Barbara's close observation of the world and her desire to know God are not to be confused with the outward activity of the mind that distracts men and women from true wisdom. Barbara acquires inward understanding by accepting the Holy Spirit, thereby permitting the knowledge of truth to become quick in her mind.

The final step in Barbara's process of spiritual alchemy takes place when Barbara leaves her tower and interacts with society. Just as Barbara's tower represents her intellectual perspective, her act of departing from the tower represents the social dimension crucial to true knowledge and salvation:

---

[225] «Сугубое и обученіе есть: внѣшнее и внутреннее: внѣшнее въ книгахъ, внутреннее въ Богомышленіи: внѣшнее въ любомудріи, внутреннее въ Боголюбіи: внѣшнее въ витіиствованіяхъ, внутреннее въ моленіяхъ: внѣшнее въ остроуміи, внутреннее въ теплотѣ духа: внѣшнее въ художествахъ, внутреннее въ помышленіяхъ: внѣшній разумъ кичитъ, внутренній же въ смиряется: внѣшній любопытствуетъ хотя вѣдати вся, внутренній же себѣ внимаетъ и ничтоже ино желаетъ вѣдати кромѣ Бога. Давидски къ нему глаголя: Тебѣ рече сердце мое: Господа взыщу, взыска тебе лице мое, лица твоего Господи взыщу. И паки: Имже образомъ желаетъ еленъ на источники водныя: сице желаетъ душа моя къ тебѣ Боже»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 146. The King James text of Ps. 27.28, with its use of second person singular and plural, is easier to follow than any contemporary English translation. The King James text of Ps. 42.1 reads, "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God."

[226] See Augustine's rhetorical program outlined in Book Four of his "On Christian Doctrine," translated by Marcus Dods in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) ser. 1, 2: 574–97.

> Following Dioscorus's departure on a faraway journey, Barbara, having freedom to come and go from her home, and freedom to engage in discussion with anyone with whom she wished to do so, became friends with some Christian girls. From them she heard the name of Jesus Christ, and suddenly her spirit rejoiced in this name. She entreated the girls to tell her all about him. And they told her everything about Christ, about his ineffable Divinity, and his Incarnation by the Most Pure Virgin Mary, of his willing Passion and Resurrection, of the coming judgment and the eternal suffering of idolaters, and the never-ceasing joy and the heavenly Kingdom that awaits Christian believers.[227]

Barbara responds suddenly to the uttering of Jesus' name: her spirit immediately rejoices. Presumably Barbara, having spent her youth alone in a tower attended by pagan servants, has never heard this name before, yet her response to its utterance is dramatic. Her response is narrated in a way that links her typologically with the biblical model of John the Baptist leaping in the womb of Elizabeth in response to Mary's salutation. Like the unborn John responding to Mary's word's, Barbara's soul responds to the name of Jesus with instant recognition. For Dymytrii speech has a power that transcends the analytic processes of the human intellect. Rather, it is the soul's intuition that governs the act of comprehension. Here Dymytrii is indicating that Barbara's soul possesses a certain unwritten, hidden knowledge that allows her to respond to the utterance of Jesus's name with immediate recognition and gladness. In this respect the soul's language, unlike the outward language that men and women use in their daily lives, is mysterious and intuitive. Whereas children are introduced to new vocabulary though social conditioning (e.g. at home and in school rooms), the soul's recognition is a response to the interior wisdom that God has endowed human beings with at the moment of their creation.

---

[227] «По отшествіи убо Діоскоровомъ въ путь далекъ, Дѣвица Варвара, имущи свободный входъ и исходъ изъ дому своего, и могущи невозбраную имѣти бесѣду съ кимъ либо восхощетъ, содружися съ нѣкими дѣвицами Хрістіанскими, и слыша отъ нихъ Имя Іисуса Хрістово, и абіе о Имени томъ возрадовася духомъ, и искаше отъ нихъ увѣдати о томъ извѣстнѣе. Оны же ей сказоваху вся яже о Хрістѣ, о неизреченномъ его Божествѣ, о Воплощеніи отъ Пречистыя Дѣвы Маріи, о волной Страсти его и Воскресеніи, о будущемъ же Судъ и вѣчной идолопоклонниномъ муцѣ, и некончаемой вѣры Хрістіаномъ радости въ небесномъ царствіи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Cheti-Minei* 2: fol. 4c, recto.

Dymytrii's St. Barbara story demonstrates that the art of speaking is as much an act of divine mystery as it is one of intellectual reason. Speech and language are at the heart of the *rhetorica spiritualis* outlined in the *Spiritual Alphabet* for true spiritual knowledge requires the engagement of the the soul's animative and reasoning faculties and must be followed by an appropriate action on the part of the body, a process embodied in the act of speaking. If a Christian wishes to master the art of language, he must become knowledgeable of the inward, intuitive mysteries of his soul's alphabet, not just the outward letters of intellectual reason. A neo-Platonist, Dymytrii believes that knowledge of the surrounding world and of God takes place according to a three-step sequence involving all three aspects of the inward human being's existence: the physical, the animative and the spiritual self. *Inventio spiritualis* requires a perceptiveness that transcends outward knowledge, directing the inward reason and understanding toward the mysteries that lie hidden beneath the world's outward sensibilities and moving the spiritual disciple to act accordingly.

Chapter Two: *Dispositio Spiritualis*

The second component of classical rhetoric—*dispositio*—has its spiritual counterpart in Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet*. While the rhetorician concerns himself with the outward arrangement of language, the spiritual rhetorician concerns himself with the inward arrangement of the soul. Eloquence requires good judgement, order, balance and proportion; these same principles are requisite for a full and spiritually satisfying life. The rhetorician's task is to strike balance and harmony into the myriad of utterances that constitute language; the spiritual rhetorician brings calm and order to the invisible chaos and misunderstanding that troubles the soul in its sinful and unhappy state. For this task, Dymytrii presents us with an anatomy of the human soul—an explanation of its component parts. Equipped with Dymytrii's spiritual anatomy, his readers may apply themselves to the work of banishing disorder and unhappiness from their inward selves and allowing God's love and grace to dwell within them.

The Classical approach to arrangement—*dispositio*—involved the manipulation of images, words and ideas to produce an effective sequence. Arrangement is a rational task and it appeals above all else to the mind's reasoning faculty. Quintilian explained that speech without arrangement is like a pile of building materials with no skilled mason to arrange and place them:

> It will merely form a confused heap unless arrangement be employed to reduce it to order and to give it connection and firmness of structure.[228]

He goes on to say, however, that arrangement is not sufficient on its own. The additional element of cohesion is required for proper *dispositio*:

---

[228] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 7. preface 1–3 (3: 3).

> And it is not enough merely to arrange the various parts: each several part has its own economy according to which one thought will come first, another second, another third, while we must struggle not merely to place these thoughts in their proper order, but to link them together and give them such cohesion that there will be no trace of any structure: they must form a body, not a congeries of limbs.[229]

Thus, *dispositio* concerns the rhetorician's ability to interconnect the various units that constitute speech. Good arrangement enables the orator to move his audience according to an orderly and progressive sequence; hence it is arrangement that gives a speech direction and authority. Stefan Iavorsky explains that after the thumb of invention, the second finger of the rhetorical hand is the index finger, representing *dispositio* (Slavonic: *razpolozhenie*). The index finger of arrangement possesses the special property of providing authority and direction during the course of a speech.[230] Hence, the speaker's authority and his ability to hold his audience's attention rests on his ability to arrange his oration in an orderly fashion.

Dispositio, however, involves more than just the practical purpose of keeping the audience mentally engaged in the orator's argument. The ideal of balance and order was deeply imprinted on all the fine arts and on all fields of intellectual study during the Baroque period. Throughout the Early Modern era humanist rhetoricians affirmed that the harmonious arrangement of speech is a reflection of the natural harmony of the cosmos:

> The harmonious order which is cosmologically a product of God's highest powers is communicated in all the arts by the artist's own understanding and impresses itself on the highest part of the receptor's mind or soul, teaching him what celestial harmony is and giving him the highest kind of pleasure, a pleasure divorced from discordant passion.[231]

---

[229] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 7.10.16 (3: 171).

[230] «Перстъ указателныи указаетъ вѣденіе и путь ко звѣздамъ»—Iavors'kyi 11.

[231] H. James Jensen 56–57

Like other humanists of his day, Dymytrii affirms the celestial harmony of the cosmos and the natural goodness of the inward human being as the work of God's own hand. The task of spiritual *dispositio* involves not the ordering of words, but the arranging of the interior world of the human soul. Theologically, the rhetorical task of ordering the interior person is one of restoring the natural goodness and rightness that was spoiled by the fall of Adam. The Christian has received new life in the new Adam, Jesus Christ, and his spiritual vocation is to restore his inward self to its original state of harmony. As proof that the natural state of the human being is one of order and good judgement, Dymytrii reminds his readers of their glorious and honorable origin: their creation in the image and likeness of God. God has endowed human beings with reason, understanding, immortality and self-government:

> Rejoice in the Lord and bring him thanks; for he created you in his image and likeness, from nonexistence into being did he bring you, with glory and honor did he crown you: he did not create you a wild animal, or a whale, or some other animal, but a man, an understanding creature. He distinguished your soul with immortality and self-government.[232]

From the above, we observe the soul's essential qualities: she is immortal and she is self-governing (*samovlasna*). She transcends the boundaries of time and she governs her own self. Whether she does good, or does evil, she does so according to her own will. No one can force the soul into doing something that she does not consent to.[233] This self-governing quality of the soul is central to Dymytrii's understanding of spiritual wellness. Emotional dis-ease is caused by soul's participation in an activity that is against her nature. The troubled mind is healed by removing the offence that goes against the soul's natural inclination. Emotional and intellectual wellness can flourish only when the soul's need for self-government is respected.[234]

---

[232] «Радуйся о Господѣ, и благодареніе ему приноси: яко сотвори тя по образу и по подобію своему, от небытія въ бытіе приведе тя, славою и честію тя вѣнча: не сотвори тя звѣремъ, ни китомъ, ни инымъ коимъ животнымъ, но человѣкомъ разумною тварію, безсмертіемъ и самовластіемъ душу твою почте»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 285–6.

[233] An illustration of this is found in his Sermon on the Last Judgement. The soul is immortal, for she rises on Judgement day. She is also self-governing, for she wills that her decayed body be reunited with her, despite her initial horror and revulsion. See below.

Dymytrii's idea of inner harmony follows the rhetorician's concern for arrangement and order. For Renaissance philologists, God himself is the primary rhetorician: the Creation of the universe was itself an act of *dispositio*: the dividing of light and darkness, the arrangement of the waters and the firmament and finally, the disposition—the inner arrangement—of the human being. In this regard, Dymytrii exhorts his readers to find joy and delight in God's correct and loving arrangement of their inner selves:

> Rejoice in the Lord and bring him thanks, for everything within you he arranged rightly and mercifully; he provides for your soul without ceasing.[235]

Good disposition is both the starting point and the final goal of the Christian's spiritual development. Good arrangement is the original and proper state of the human being. Inward confusion is unnatural to the soul, for the human being is by nature inclined to harmonious disposition. This well-ordered state, however, can easily become disordered: confusion arises and sin and disobedience follow. The troubled sinner must learn how to restore and maintain the proper, harmonious arrangement of his inner self. The art of Christian living consists in directing the inward self along the path of order and harmony that is natural to God's creation.

Because *dispositio* is the concern that is most central to Dymytrii's way of thinking as a rhetorician, it is not surprising that the structure of his *Alphabet* itself adheres to the ideal of a harmonious and well-balanced arrangement. Dymytrii arranges his text into alphabetical chapters and each chapter is in turn arranged into alphabetical verses. In explaining his reason for doing so, Dymytrii underlines a crucial point that explains why good order is necessary. He says:

---

[234] See chapter three, "*Elocutio Spiritualis*."

[235] «Радуйся о Господѣ, и благодареніе ему приноси яко вся о тебѣ праведнѣ и милосерднѣ устрои; непрестанно промышляеть о души твоей»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 286.

> These chapters have been composed according to short verses to enable a person to learn [them] by heart, for in the time of the passionate struggle, he will not always have the time to look in this little book itself.[236]

Rather than formal, aesthetic reasons for arrangement, Dymytrii gives the practical explanation that a well-arranged and concise lesson is easier to grasp and keep in mind (*memoria*). For the rhetorician, the ability of the audience to follow and properly understand the speaker's words is crucial to the success or failure of the communicative situation. Augustine insisted that it is the orator's duty to ensure that his speech is clearly intelligible to everyone of his listeners: "Two conditions are to be insisted upon, that our hearer or companion should have an earnest desire to learn the truth and should have the capacity of mind to receive it in whatever form it may be communicated, the teacher being not so anxious about the eloquence as about the clearness of his teaching."[237]

Dymytrii understands that a well disposed instruction is both easier to absorb and easier to remember. Rote-learning and memorization of the individual verses of the *Alphabet* provide the student with a *copia verborum* that he can call upon as he works his way through the task of Christian living. Cicero similarly advised orators to develop the art of memorization to equip themselves for rhetorical situations that require impromptu speech. Dymytrii applies this concept to the more important art of spiritual living: a well disposed mind, armed with spiritual wisdom, is the Christian's best defence in a world full of temptation and spiritual confusion. Not only is harmonious arrangement the student's intended destination, it is also the means by which Dymytrii teaches it.

---

[236] «Краткими же стіхослогами написашася сія главизны, яко да возможетъ кто удобъ наизусть навыкнути себѣ въ требованіе страстнаго сопротивоборця, не всегда имѣяй время взирати въ самую книжицу»— Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 289.

[237] Augustine 2: 581–82.

Dymytrii's emphasis on cosmological order and harmony reveals an approach to Christian philosophy that is markedly neo-Platonic, neo-Pythagorean and humanist. The idea that God is the primordial rhetorician and that human beings are to study the harmonious arrangement of the cosmos and apply it to their daily lives, contrasts with the traditional dualism of medieval Christianity—both Latin and Byzantine. Ironically, neo-Platonism itself originated as a pagan response to the dualistic tendencies of early Christianity, as represented by such movements as Gnosticism and Manichaeism. It was Marsilio Ficino's Latin translation of Plotinus's *Enneades* that revived neo-Platonism during the Renaissance as part of the humanists' endeavor to reconcile the pagan classics with Christian faith.

Dymytrii's choice of title for his work, *The Spiritual Alphabet* , is striking when we place it against the intellectual currents of his time. It is the alphabet, i.e., the letters that visually represent the patterns of human speech, that directs human beings along the path of spiritual wisdom. For Dymytrii, as for any other Early Modern grammarian and rhetorician, the letters of the alphabet were not merely a practical medium to facilitate communication. Rather, each letter carried profound symbolic value, hidden in its visual form—a concept dating back to the classical period. The humanists revived the classical belief that letters are the fundamental elements of the cosmos and the transmitters of all knowledge, human and divine.[238] By arranging his work in alphabetical form, Dymytrii is not simply opting for a practical solution to the everyday problem of rhetorical *dispositio*. On a profound level he is stating his belief in a cosmic order that lies hidden behind the visual forms of the alphabet. For Dymytrii there are two alphabets, the outward one consisting of characters drawn on paper and the inward alphabet of symbolic values that harmoniously order the cosmos, including the micro-cosmos of the human soul. A Christian neo-Platonist, Dymytrii reminds his readers that it is the art of interior letters that is the highest and most noble object of intellectual enquiry.

It is also revealing that Dymytrii calls his work a *spiritual* (in Slavonic *dukhovnyi*) alphabet and not an alphabet of the *soul* (in Slavonic *dushevnyi*). The spirit is the reasoning faculty of the soul; the soul depends upon her reason in order to perceive time, progress, logic and the other things that alert human beings to the fact that they are awake, that is, in a state of consciousness. The soul herself dwells in the subconscious; her realm is one of eternity, ritual and mystery. The soul's reason—the understanding spirit—exists within this place of mystery. The *Spiritual Alphabet*, like all alphabets, appeals to reason and logic, but at the same time it exists within the soul's larger realm of mystery and paradox.

Dymytrii's fascination with the alphabet and his fascination with numbers reveal the Pythagorean influence that permeates neo-Platonic philosophy in both its pagan and Christian variants. The link between neo-Platonism and neo-Pythagoreanism during the Renaissance is a complex one, dating back to the origins of these two movements during the first centuries of the Christian era. As Johanna Drucker points out:

---

[238] See Drucker 85–86. Alphabet symbolism was part of the "white magic" tendencies of learned people of the Renaissance, including Ficino and the Florentine humanists—hence the Catholic church regarded it with suspicion. See: *Renaissance Magic*, ed. Brian P. Levack (New York: Garland, 1992).

> The links between Pythagoreanism and neo-Platonism in this period [i.e., the third century C.E.] are complex, but certain figures, such as Nicomachus of Gesara, made elaborate use of number symbolism which was in turn appropriated by the neo-Platonists. In neo-Pythagorean cosmology a general sympathy connected all parts of the spheres of the cosmos, the so-called harmony of the spheres. The structure of these harmonic relations was of course mathematical and as the order of the material universe had emerged, in Pythagorean belief systems, from the One, the understanding of this cosmic harmony was a means of studying and accessing the One. Such notions were readily assimilated into a neo-Platonic belief that goodness and order were to be found in form and harmony, measure and limit—rather than in the dualistic struggles of Zoroastrianism, Gnosticism and Christianity.[239]

For Dymytrii, the cosmos is the highly structured, rigidly hierarchical world of humanist neo-Platonism.[240] The material world is a manifestation of divine mystery and power; hence, it is proper that men and women study the created world and learn the divine mysteries that are inscribed upon it. Throughout Dymytrii's sermons and Saints' lives, the created world repeatedly serves as a book of divine revelation that leads men and women to the understanding of God.[241] The physical perceptions of the human senses—vision, hearing, smell, taste and touch—are the gateways to soul's sensibilities. Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* teaches its readers that sensibility—that is, the soul's perception of the material world—is the means by which the human being comes to know and understand God.

The idea that a cosmological world-view characteristic of Renaissance humanism should find such resonance in the works of a seventeenth-century

---

[239] See the chapter entitled "The Alphabet in Classical History, Philosophy and Divination" in Drucker 49–92.
[240] See Drucker 159.
[241] See my discussion of the St. Barbara story in chapter one, "*Inventio Spiritualis.*"

Orthodox cleric is not simply attributed to the importation of a Latinate educational model to Ukraine and Belarus. Throughout the history of the Christian church the cosmological beliefs of neo-Platonism have coexisted alongside the anti-cosmological tendencies of such movements as Gnosticism and Manichaeism.[242] The dualist tendency to place the material world in opposition to the spiritual world is well-represented in Orthodox thought, particularly in monastic culture.[243] At the same time, however, the patristic tradition that denounced Manichaeism as a heresy and affirmed the early Christian belief that God is one with the universe and that the material world bears testimony to God's existence, has coexisted with this dualistic element that flows throughout Christianity.[244] Against this background Dymytrii's writings represent a shifting tide in Christian philosophy, away from the dualistic tendencies of medieval Orthodox monasticism and a return to the cosmological unity of the early Church. At the same time, however, he fully embodies Renaissance humanism and its call to return to the ancient, primary sources of the early Christian faith. Dymytrii's cosmological neo-Platonism is indeed a legacy of humanism's influence on seventeenth-century European intellectual life, but it also constitutes a return to the patristic tradition of Orthodox theology.

Like Comenius, Dymytrii understands that the child's true ability to learn comes not from academic discipline, but exists naturally within him as a gift from heaven.[245] Academic discipline exists only to facilitate and expedite that which is already natural to the child. For Dymytrii the same principle applies to spiritual learning, for the soul's ability to acquire spiritual understanding is likewise intuitive to its nature. Hence, as with all other kinds of wisdom, book learning is secondary and indeed may even be disposed of altogether:

---

[242] See Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600) = The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* 1 (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1971) 83–94, 300–1.

[243] See: *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650–c.1450: Selected Sources*, trans. Janet Hamilton and Bernard Hamilton (New York and Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998).

[244] The church father most well-known for his struggle against Manichaeism is Augustine and his *De moribus catholicae et de moribus manichaeorum*. See Donald A. Gallagher and Idella J. Gallagher's English translation, *The Catholic and Manichaean Ways of Life* (Washington: Catholic U of America P, 1966).

> Just as the smallest child does not need teaching in order to gaze at the world with the eyes of his body (assuming that his vision is not damaged), one does not need outward learning for spiritual wisdom. For the uniting of the understanding with the Lord only one thing is necessary: the purification and enlightenment of the mind. There are many who received no education and who remained most simple and yet they learned with a mind quick in spiritual wisdom and with obedience to the Lord's commandments and they entered into the great choir [of the saints]. Such for example, were Anthony, Pachomius, the most simple Paul and others.[246]

Dymytrii's statement concerning vision is important. Healthy vision is needed if a child is to perceive the world around him. If the senses are damaged, then the child's sensibilities will be impaired. Likewise, the soul requires healthy sensibilities if it is to correctly interpret the world and exercise correct judgement.[247] In Dymytrii's sermons devoted to the healing narratives of the Gospels, the spiritual torments of unfortunate individuals are attributed to an impairment of the soul's sensibilities. The soul of the sinner is blinded with an infirmity and this blindness leads to sin. In Dymytrii's re-telling of these narratives, Jesus' healing power restores the damaged sensibilities of the troubled soul. Jesus restores the inward vision of the human being that is essential for spiritual well-being.

---

[245] Comenius distinguished between three kinds of learning: (1) intuitive, based on the senses; (2) comparative, or simple reasoning based on items in two's; (3) ideative, or complex reasoning based on items in groups. See Comenius, *Comenius's Pampaedia* 100.

[246] «Якоже и малѣйшее отроча не требуетъ ученія тѣлесныма очима зрѣти свѣтъ (аще не недужно есть зрѣніемъ) сице не требуетъ кто и внѣшняго ученія ко премудрости духовнѣй, и соединненію разумомъ Господеви, точію очищенія и просвѣщенія умнаго. Мнози бо не точію внѣшняго ученія неискусни но и отнюдъ препрости бывше, премудрости духовныя умнымъ дѣланіемъ, сохраненіемъ Господнихъ заповѣдей научишася, и великимъ хором причастницы быша, якоже Антоній, Пахомій, Паѵелъ препростый, и иніи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 302–3.

[247] See chapter four, "*Memoria Spiritualis.*"

An example is his story of the healing of the Gadarene demoniac (Luke 8.26–39) from his sermon for the feast of St. Michael, entitled "The Battle of the Holy Archangel Michael, Commander of the Heavenly Hosts and his Angels against the Seven-Headed Dragon." This sermon was preached in Kyiv, at the Monastery of St. Michael of the Golden Domes, on November 8 (Old Style) 1697. The feast-day coincided with the Twenty-Third Sunday after Pentecost, during which the story of the Gadarene demoniac is read during the Sunday Gospel. In explaining this narrative Dymytrii quotes St. Gregory the Theologian and St. Theophylact of Ochrid[248] explaining that the legion of demons that possessed the Gadarene were the seven deadly sins and associates each sin with one kind of behavior demonstrated by the Gadarene:

> 1. "Crying out in the hills"—this indicates the first deadly sin: pride. To tread the hill of lofty thinking, to endeavor to rise above others, to think greatly of oneself and even more, to shout and praise and glorify oneself vainly—this is a deadly sin. O fiend! Your lot is in the abyss; in a fallen state you dwell, not shouting on the hill. Alas, do you know not that it is written, "all loftiness is an abomination unto God"?[249]
>
> 2. "Dwelling in graves"—this indicates the second deadly sin: lust. For the one who has estranged himself from God's grace, which gives life to the soul of man, is like a dead body, stinking in a grave. "My (spiritual) wounds stink and are corrupt" (Ps. 38.5)[250]

---

[248] Dymytrii's source is St. Theophylact's (fl. 1078) commentary on the Gospels. Dymytrii's library contains a copy of the Moscow edition, published in 1649 under the title, *Tolkovanie na Evangeliie [Blagovestnik]*.

[249] «Бъ горахъ бѣ вопія: то знакъ перваго грѣха смертнаго—гордости, горою высокоумія ходити, надъ всѣхъ пястися, много о себѣ разумѣти, а еще вопити, хвалитися, тщеславитися,—то грѣхъ смертный. О враже! а твоя рѣчь въ безднѣ, въ пропасти жити, а не на гору дертися! А зась не вѣдаешь писаннаго: все высокое мерзостно есть у Бога?»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 102.

[250] «Живяше во гробѣхъ: то знакъ втораго грѣха смертнаго—нечистоты; тая бовѣмъ, стративши ласку Божію, яко душу человѣка оживляючую, подобна есть трупу мертвому, въ гробѣ смердящему: возсмердѣша и согниша

3."Not clothing himself in garments"—this indicates the third deadly sin: gluttony, indulgence, drunkenness, which even the righteous Noah succumbed to. Is there anything else in the world that leads a man to nakedness, poverty, destitution as does gluttony and drunkenness. It is well said, "He who loves wine and oil will not become wealthy, but naked.[251]

4. "No one was able to restrain his path"—this indicates the fourth deadly sin: greed. For he spent his time in taverns, stealing and assaulting. And who in this world is more excessive and more evil in his greed than the thief? For he lives only to commit offences against his neighbors, to destroy, to steal, to assault, to take away, to snatch, in order to satisfy his insatiable greed. But greed is difficult to satisfy, for it is written: "Hell and destruction are never full; so the eyes of man are never satisfied" (Prov. 27.20)[252]

5. "Tearing his iron shackles"—this indicates the fifth deadly sin: anger, wrath, fury. Is there anything that can tear it, break it, or crush it? In the presence of anger iron is but straw and chains are but spider-webs.[253]

6. "Trampling on stone"—this indicates the sixth deadly sin: jealously. For this one is like a stone of wicked words that is cast against one's neighbor from afar—even if it is thrown from a hundred miles away and into a foreign land it finds its target. Striking him down before other men, judging and detracting his good honor, at once turning to stone.[254]

душевныя раны»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 102. Note that Dymytrii uses the Ukrainian word *nechystota* i.e., "uncleanliness" rather than the Slavonic *blud* in this specific reference to sexual transgression.

[251] «Въ рызу не облачашеся: то знакъ третьяго грѣха смертнаго—обжирства, жарлоцтва, пiянства, которое и праведникъ Ноевъ обнажати умѣетъ; щожъ бовѣмъ такъ на свѣтѣ человѣка до наготы, до убозства, но недзи приводитъ, яко обжирство, пьянство? Не дармо написано: любяй вино и масло не обогатѣетъ, нагъ будетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 102.

[252] «Никтоже можаше минути путемъ тѣмъ: то знакъ четвертаго грѣха смертнаго—лакомства; бо, на гостинцахъ засѣдаючи, разбивалъ, шарпалъ. А которы жъ на свѣтѣ разбойникъ и шарпалъ есть больши и горши надъ лакомство? Тое альбовѣмъ зъ того тылко и живетъ, що кривды ближнимъ чинити, разбивати, красти, шарпати, одеймовати, выдирати, бы несытое свое насытити есть: адъ и погибель ненасыщается; сице и человѣчи очи несыты суть»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 102–3.

[253] «Растерзая узы желѣзныя: то знакъ пятаго грѣха смертнаго—гнѣва, ярости, лютости, которая чого жъ не порветъ, не поломаетъ, не покрушитъ? и желѣзо ей, яко солома, и ланцухи, якъ паутина»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 103.

[254] «Толча каменiемъ: то знакъ грѣха шестаго смертнаго—зависти: тая альбовѣмъ, яко каменiемъ, злыми словами на ближняго кидаетъ издалека, бы и за сто миль и въ чужомъ краю досягнетъ, опаче предъ людми удаючи,

> 7. "Not living in houses"—this indicates the seventh deadly sin: indolence, that is, indifference to the praise of God. For he did not frequent God's temples, not even but once a year, not even at the end of the Divine Service, not even for the sake of just quickly hearing the dismissal "Let us depart in peace."[255]

Aside from Dymytrii's added embellishments to the Gospel story, the passage above reveals the highly ordered style of his sermon-writing. He starts by organizing the Gadarene narrative into seven basic components and each component is then associated with one of seven sins that torment the unhappy man. Because the Gadarene is afflicted with seven vices, to heal him will require seven antidotes: the seven virtues. Seven physicians appear to administer the seven antidotes to the Gadarene and they are the seven Archangels who decapitate the seven-headed dragon of the Apocalypse:

> 1. The Holy Archangel Michael, defender of God's honor and glory, strikes that dragon-head with a vengeful, double-edged sword. One edge is sharpened with the knowledge of God the Creator and the second edge is sharpened with self-knowledge.[256]
>
> 2. The Holy Archangel Gabriel, the pure evangelist of the most pure Virgin's most pure conception Emmanuel, stands against that unclean head. He stands with light, that is the lantern (as is used at night) that chases away obscurity and that stands up against sin, facing it, shattering it, putting it to shame and giving punishment. And at once there rises up a mirror, so that that

---

осуждаючи, добрую славу уймуючи, праве каменуетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 103.

[255] «Въ храмѣхъ не живяше: то знакъ седмаго грѣха смертнаго—лѣнивства, а лѣнивства до хвалы Божой; тое альбовѣмъ не радо до храмовъ Божіихъ вчащати, а хоцъ коли якъ роковый и побываетъ, то тескнитъ набоженствомъ, и радъ бы якъ найскорѣй почути: со миром изыдемъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov *Propovedi* 103. Dymytrii is here playing with a double meaning of the word *khram*: in the Biblical context it denotes a house, while in his contemporary context it would have also meant "temple."

[256] «Святыи архистратигъ Михаилъ, чести и славы Божой оборонца, ткнетъ по зміевой той главѣ отмстителнимъ мечемъ, обоюду острымъ, который едной стороны наощренъ познаніемъ Бога Творца своего, зъ другой стороны наощренъ познаніемъ себе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 103.

abominable head, like the treacherous basilisk beholding his repulsiveness, dies from his own reflection.[257]

3. Against that insatiable third dragon-head the angel Raphael, the server of divine healing, rises up with medicine. For along with gluttony, drunkenness gives rise to the greatest number of sicknesses, not only physical but spiritual. "And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and the cares of this life" (Luke 21.34). For this reason a good physician with effective medicine is necessary. And such a physician is St. Raphael, whose medicine is effective poison to the dragon and effective healing to man. This physician places the man's heart upon a burning coal, until out flees the devil, for it is written in the book of Tobit: this smoke casts out all kinds of demon from man and woman . . . .And by this example he teaches each one of us, place your heart upon the burning coal of God's love and your body's passionate appetite will be dried up and your desire defeated by fasting. [258]

4. The fourth angel, St. Uriel, the server of divine love, strikes that head with a sword and flame: the sword wounds and kills and the flame burns it to ashes. For the sword and the flame indicate divine love. He whose heart is wounded with the love of God like a sword and whose heart burns with desire for God like a flame, of him the Apostle says, "all these things—silver, gold, possessions and all the wealth of the transient world—I would exchange that I may win Christ (Phil. 3.8).[259]

---

[257] «Стаетъ противъ той нечистой головы святыи Гавріилъ, чистый Пречистой Дѣвы пречистаго зачатія Еммануилева благовѣстникъ, а стаетъ зъ свѣтлою (яко въ ночи) лихтарнею, тму вшетеченства отгоняющею, а якобы на грѣху застаючи, обличаючи, громячи, завстидаючи, и казнь наносячи, оразъ и съ презорчистымъ стаетъ зѣрцадлом, абы тое шкаредное голвиско, якъ зрадливый базѣлешекъ свою въ зѣрцадлѣ шпѣтность увидѣвши само отъ своего взорку здохло»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 104.

[258] «Противъ той несытой головы зміевы третій аггелъ Рафаилъ, служитель божественныхъ цѣльбъ, заставляется зъ лекарствомъ; бо поневажъ съ обжирства, піянства найбольшъ хоробъ, не тылько тѣлеснихъ, але и душевнихъ ся родитъ, для того и остерегаютъ: блюдѣтеся, да не когда отягчаютъ сердца ваша объяденіемъ, и піянствомъ, и печальми житейскими. Тутъ теды и лекаря добраго зъ лекарствомъ скутечнимъ треба, а тожь таковый лекарь—Рафаилъ святый, котораго лекарство скутечною есть зміемы трутизною, а человѣкомъ скутечною цѣльбою. Кладетъ той лекаръ сердце на жаристое угліе, ажъ діаволъ бѣжитъ ни-обзиръ, яко въ Товіиной пишется книзѣ: дымъ той прогонитъ всякъ родъ демонскъ или отъ мужа или отъ жены . . . . А тым поступкомъ кождого учитъ: клади сердце твое на жаристое угліе любве Божія, а вилготность тѣла твоего страстную высушь, выпалъ воздержаніемъ, постомъ!»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 104.

[259] «Четвертый аггелъ святый Уріилъ, служителъ божественныя любве, на тую голову добываетъ меча а оразъ и огня, мечемъ абы поразилъ и убилъ, огнемъ абы спалилъ въ порохъ. И мечъ и огнъ то суть любве божественныя

5. Against that dragon-head of anger rises up St. Salathiel, who at all times prays to God on behalf of mankind. And his prayers are like a river of flame and anger is engulfed by its fiery opponent. And that head is wounded and slain as it were by strong arrows, teaching each one of us not to be angry or wrathful to our neighbor, remembering the words of David, "Cease from anger and forsake wrath" (Ps. 37.8).[260]

6. The sixth angel, St. Jehudiel, punishes the sixth dragon-head of jealousy with a black, three-headed scourge. Black is for harsh punishment;. The first head of the three heads is separation from God's grace, the second is eternal embitterment and the third is darkness without end.[261]

7. St. Barakiel poisons and kills the dragon-head of the seventh deadly sin of indolence with the fragrance of white roses that are endowed with the blessings and Divine gifts given to man.

The following is known concerning the nature of the rose flower: it is beneficial to the bees who gather honey from it and it is poison to the beetles, who quickly die upon tasting this flower.

The spiritual flower of heavenly blessings and Divine gifts (represented by the white roses of St. Barakiel) that we carry in our bosoms is poison to the devil, for from it shines the grace of God, routing the devil's power and giving life to man. For just as the rose's fragrance entices the bee to collect honey, so does the divine flower of gratitude motivate the human being to the tireless work of struggles and endeavors, earning for ourselves the sweetness of eternal blessing. "Come, ye blessed" (Matt. 25.34).[262]

знаки. Кто мѣетъ сердце свое любовію Божіею уязвленное, яко мечемъ, кто мѣетъ сердце свое желаніемъ Бога распаленное, яко огнемъ, той зъ апостоломъ отзивается: вся сія, и сребро, и злато, и имѣнія, и вся богатества суетнаго міра уметы вмѣнихъ быти, да Хріста пріобрящу»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 104–5.

[260] «Стаетъ противъ той зміевой яростной головы святый Селаѳіилъ, выну къ Богу о родѣ человѣчестѣмъ моляйся, а молитвами своими яко рѣкою огнь, ярость огнепалную вражію затопляетъ, и яко моцними стрѣлами голову тую уязвляетъ и убиваетъ, а насъ безгнѣвіи къ ближнему, незлобія учачи, умоминаетъ кождаго Давидски: престани на гнѣва, остави ярость»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 105.

[261] «Шестую голову зміеву зависти шестый аггелъ святый Егудіилъ бичемъ тревервнымъ чернимъ цвѣчитъ: чернимъ,—то есть срогимъ караньемъ; тревервнимъ,—то есть отъятіемъ отъ него благодати Божой—то вервъ единъ; вѣчнимъ ожесточеніемъ—то вервъ другій; и безконечнимъ потемненіемъ—то вервъ третій»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 105.

[262] «Семую голову зміеву седмаго грѣха смертнаго лѣности святый Барахіилъ запахомъ рожь бѣлыхъ, которыми суть благословенства и дарованіи Божіи человѣкомъ чрезъ руки его подаваемыи, тыми оную труитъ и убиваетъ.

Dymytrii's source of angelic invention is the Jesuit Cornelius a Lapide's commentary on the book of Revelation. The names of these seven angels and their descriptions are taken from the mosaics that originally adorned the *thermae* of Diocletian's baths in Rome (restored by Michelangelo and now known as the Church of Santa Maria degli Angeli) and that were later copied onto the walls of the cathedral in Palermo, Sicily. The story of these images is retold by Lapide in his own scriptural commentary.[263]

Psychologically, the healing of the Gadarene demonic consists of restoring the balance and order that has gone awry in his soul. Firstly, the man is tormented by his own pride and self-importance. To restore calmness and humility, the man must acquire two kinds of knowledge: knowledge of God and self-knowledge. Thus, pride is nothing but an undesirable state of ignorance and self-alienation; its obverse, humility, is a desirable state of understanding and self-awareness. The demoniac cannot be saved by his own initiative—St. Michael must intervene. Likewise, if Christians wish to restore harmony to their inward selves, they must seek Divine intervention through prayer. The work of repentance is not a narcissistic task carried out by the individual, it requires cooperation, that is, synergy between the human being and God.

О цвѣтѣ рожномъ повѣдають естествословцы, же яко пчеламъ есть користь,—медъ зъ него збираютъ; такъ хрущомъ дознаная трутизна,—скоро того цвѣта вкусятъ, здыхаютъ.

Духовный цвѣтъ небесныхъ благословенствъ и дарованій Божіихъ, чрезъ бѣлыя рожи святымъ Барахіиломъ въ нѣдрехъ носимыи образуемыхъ, заисте есть отрутою діяволу,—идѣже бо осіяетъ благодать Божія, оттуду прогонится діаволя сыла, а животъ дательная есть користь человѣку. Якъ бовѣмъ рожа запахомъ своимъ повабляетъ пчелу до збиранія меду, такъ духовный оный цвѣтъ вдячностію своею побуждаетъ человѣка до нелѣностныхъ працъ подвиговъ и трудовъ, заслугуючихъ себѣ въ небѣ слодкость вѣчнаго благословенства онаго: пріидите благословенныи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 106.

[263] Dymytrii's explanation is in his *Propovedi* 101–2. For more on Lapide's description of the angels that adorned both Diocletian's baths and the Palermo church, see Theodor Klauser, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt* (Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1950) 5: 208–31.

This type of synergy is demonstrated in the angels' interventions. Illumination and reflection—Gabriel's lantern and mirror—are the instruments employed to heal the demoniac's lust. If human beings are to become spiritually chaste it is their responsibility to avoid spiritual darkness, to seek light, and to reflect upon their actions. Similarly the Archangel Raphael heals the Gadarene's gluttony and drunkenness with the burning coal of God's love. Just as a burning coal purifies whatever instrument is placed upon it, God's love purifies the human heart that is offered unto him. In this, however, man's cooperation is required, for Christians must fast in order to purify themselves with the coal of God's love.

All of Dymytrii's angels bear some sort of instrument, either a sensible object or an abstract one, such as prayer. The fourth angel, Uriel, bears the sword of God's love and the flame of desire for God; Salathiel brings prayers of flame; Jehudiel a black, three-headed scourge; and finally Barakiel carries flowers. In Church Slavonic grammar the instrumental case is used to signify tool, agent, means and manner—various types of attendant circumstance.[264] Spiritually the act of healing likewise requires some sort of additional agent, such as prayer, fasting, reflection, mindfulness of God's love and grace. Just as the philosopher's stone is essential for the alchemist to succeed in his alchemic transformations, the troubled soul requires some sort of instrument to undergo spiritual transformation.

Dymytrii's seventh angel illustrates that purity of heart is the difference between spiritual life and death. The bees represent purity of intention and to them the roses yield honey. The beetles in question, in Ukrainian *khrushchi* (Latin *Melolontha melolontha*) are a large European beetle destructive to vegetation as an adult. The rose, however, poisons this unwelcome visitor. Similarly, the heavenly blessings and Divine gifts represented by St. Barakiel's roses are life and nourishment to man, but poison to the devil. The toxicity of these roses consists of the good deeds that pious men and women offer to God in gratitude.

---

[264] Horace G. Lunt, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar* (The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1974) 132.

The healing of the Gadarene demoniac commenced with the double-edged sword of St. Michael: knowledge of God and self-knowledge are the beginning of the man's path to physical and spiritual wholeness. Note that two kinds of knowledge are mentioned and a third is not: St. Michael's sword is not sharpened with the knowledge of the world. For Dymytrii, the art of spiritual healing is one of restoring the inward harmony of the soul, not the outward acumen of the intellect. The soul's knowledge is natural to the inward person and is a gift from God, while outward knowledge is acquired by observing and learning from the surrounding world. The soul's reasoning faculty—its mind—is the source of all knowledge and its reason the source of all outward learning:

> The mind is greater than all the outward learning of letters. It is not from letters, from outward learning, that the mind learns to comprehend and grows, but rather, it is from the mind that all these things come about and flourish. The mind naturally is given to every person from God, while the understanding of outward wisdom comes from man. For this sake we must, above all else, be diligent in the cleansing of our understanding.[265]

In Dymytrii's anatomy of the soul, it is the soul's reason that occupies the highest position in the hierarchy of the inward human being. It is significant that Dymytrii places the soul's reason—the mind or the intellect of the soul—as the natural source of all knowledge. The intellect does not learn from books, but rather, books are produced from the inward understanding of the soul. Thus, as a pedagogue Dymytrii does not see the instructor's task as one of filling the mind of the student, but rather, helping the student realize his own natural inclination to wisdom and good judgement.

---

[265] «Первѣйшій есть умъ паче ученія внѣшняго писмена. Не бо от писмене, и ученія внѣшняго обрѣтеся и возрасте умъ: но от ума вся сія родишася и возрастоша. Богъ естественно умъ комуждо даде, внѣшняго же ученія разумъ от человѣкъ прибысть. Того ради паче всѣхъ должни есмы имѣти тщаніе о очищеніи разума»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 304.

The Order of Speech: Language and Inward Disposition

Dymytrii entitles the third chapter of the *Alphabet*, "On how in all things one should follow the path of understanding and good judgement and not that of the inarticulate flesh."[266] The title reveals much about Dymytrii's approach to language and inward wisdom. The act of speaking is one that naturally bridges the two worlds of flesh and spirit. Without understanding and good judgement, the body is inarticulate. Human flesh is well-equipped with the tools required for speech: tongue, lips, throat and so on. However, if there is no understanding, the body remains speechless. Thus, for speech to occur, the body and the soul must cooperate. The soul's intellect tempers the sounds made by the human mouth and throat and endows these utterances with meaning.

Speechlessness in Biblical narratives is an attribute shared by a number of characters: Zacharias the father of John the Baptist (Luke 1.20), the dumb man possessed by a demon who is healed by Jesus (Matt. 9.32, Luke 11.14), the blind and dumb man to whom Jesus gives sight and speech (Matt. 12.22) and the deaf man with an impediment to his speech, whom Jesus heals by touching his ears and tongue (Mark 7.32). Zacharias is struck with dumbness because he does not believe the words of the Angel Gabriel. The dumb men of Matthew and Luke's narrative's are possessed by demons. The Evangelist Mark does not give the reason for his character's deafness and speech impediment. However, this story shares the seventh chapter of his Gospel with the healing of a Greek woman's daughter possessed by an unclean spirit (Mark 7.24-30) and with Jesus' discourse with the Pharisees on defilement (Mark 7.1-23).

---

[266] «О еже во всемъ послѣдовати разуму и разсужденію, неже безсловесной плоти»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 308.

Speechlessness does not so much indicate a lack of understanding, but rather the presence of misunderstanding. The human being who falls into a state of dumbness indeed possesses a kind of understanding, for all human being's contain the reasoning soul within them. Speechlessness is caused by a disorder or an impairment of the understanding. In Dymytrii's re-tellings of biblical narratives concerning dumbness, such as "Rachel's Lament" from the *Nativity Drama*, speechlessness is caused by doubt and misunderstanding.[267] A link exists between these two: the ethical consequence of misunderstanding is sin and therefore sin is nothing but a lack of judgement. Similarly spiritual doubt reveals an impairment—or a sickness—that afflicts the soul's understanding and good judgement:

> Just as the blind man walks not without mishap, nor can the confused man be capable of doing good. For this reason do not hold yourself to fleshly wants and desires, but instead only follow in all things understanding and good judgement.[268]

Again we see the complex relationship between the body and soul that is at the heart of Dymytrii's Christian philosophy. The soul is wedded to the body; she cannot perform her good deeds and acts of charity without a body to work with. At the same time, she must not be ruled by her flesh, but rather her understanding and good judgement must direct the body along the path of virtuous living. Like a wedded couple, body and soul must cooperate with one another. If they fail to do so, the results are catastrophic: both the soul and the body will succumb to sin and together they will perish. It is imperative that the soul's reason and understanding govern the body's desires:

---

[267] See chapter three, "*Elocutio Spiritualis.*"

[268] «Якоже не безбѣдно слѣпый шествуетъ, сице ниже безумный что творитъ благо. Сего ради не повинуйся плотстѣй похоти и желанію, но точію во всѣхъ вещехъ разуму и разсужденію всегда послѣдуй»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 308.

> No one can fall down and sin, if he follows understanding and good judgement; nor can he do any good, if he does not have true understanding. Just as confusion (and dumb ignorance of the self) is the source and root of every sin, so are true understanding and good judgement the source of every goodness.[269]

We see several parallel relationships in the text above. Every person who possesses good judgement and reason will stand upright in the midst of temptation. At the same time, every person who does not possess true understanding remains incapable of virtuous living. The ethical consequences of this are significant: people who behave virtuously, but do so in ignorance and without understanding, do not possess true virtue. Medieval and Renaissance philosophers explain that the eunuch is not to be commended for his sexual chastity, for sexual desire is unknown to him. The truly virtuous person is the one who is knowledgeable of temptations and who resists them despite his passionate desires.

To resist temptation, all that is necessary is understanding and self-knowledge, for reason and good judgement are the source of all virtue. Seven decades later, the emphasis on self-knowledge in Dymytrii's *Alphabet* would be mirrored in Skovoroda's colloquy *A Conversation Called "The Alphabet or The Primer of the World'* based it on the theme of self-knowledge. Skovoroda even inscribed the words "Know Thyself" in Latin, Greek and Hebrew at the beginning of his colloquy.[270] Again, we detect a certain continuity between Skovoroda's colloquies and Dymytrii's *Alphabet*. Dymytrii, like Skovoroda, believed that without understanding the human being succumbs to confusion and self-ignorance, and that this is the source and root of every evil. The task of the spiritual student is to know the world around him, to know the world within him and to exercise good judgement. Without self-understanding, the human being makes his way through life like a blind man, feeling and touching many things along the way, but seeing nothing. As Dymytrii explains:

---

[269] «Никтоже можетъ пасти и согрѣшити, разуму и разсужденію послѣдуя, ниже содѣяти что благо, не имѣяй праваго разума: якоже начало и корень всякому грѣхъ безумѣе есть, и безсловесное себе непознаніе, сице и начало всякому благу правъ разумъ и разсужденіе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 309.

> A man who is blind in his physical eyes, walks along and feels his way, touching things frequently and in many ways. In the same manner, a man who does not have true understanding, nor follows good judgement, will always walk in the darkness of confusion and sin. If one knows himself and beholds the light of the mind, then always and in everything he will be unscathed.[271]

Dymytrii's Christian ethics approaches the subject of sin with compassion and an understanding of human weakness. Christian ascetics for centuries have warned their disciples not to succumb to passionate desires. Dymytrii, however, takes this to a psychological level, seeking to understand the inward forces that push a human being to forsake good judgement and to choose sin over virtue:

> What is sin? It is but the acting out of carnal desires. What is the acting out of carnal desires? It is nothing more than confusion. No one can sin, except in a state of misunderstanding and lack of judgement. Likewise, no one can do good, except in a state of understanding. Nor can he do anything evil, so long as he is not confused.[272]

---

[270] Natalia Pylypiuk, "The Primary Door: At the Threshold of Skovoroda's Theology and Poetics" 564.

[271] «Слѣпый внѣшнима очима во всѣхъ стезяхъ своихъ многажды и различно претыкается: сице и не имѣяй праваго разума, ниже послѣдуя разсужденію, во тмѣ неразумія и грѣха всегда шествуетъ. Познавый же себе, и зряй мысленный свѣтъ, всегда во всемъ непреткновенъ есть»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 309.

[272] «Что есть грѣхъ; точію плотскія же похоти дѣйствіе. Плотскія же похоти дѣйствіе что есть; Ничтоже ино, точію безуміе: и никтоже согрѣши, точію въ

Dymytrii is mindful of the hypocrisy that moves men and women to condemn others for their perceived moral failings. Sin is not a simple question of misbehavior but is a reflection of the human being's spiritual confusion and his impaired judgement. The real issue is not the sinful act itself, but the spiritual unhappiness and inward chaos that leads a person to make poor decisions in life. Rather than the condemnation of sinners, Dymytrii offers compassion for their inner turmoil and confusion. Fears of eternal torment and punishment in the after-life will do nothing to heal the troubled soul. Instead, the rehabilitation of the sinner can be done only by restoring the inner calm and spiritual peace that are essential for the soul's well-being and happiness:

> Misunderstanding always precedes every sin; likewise reason precedes good deeds and good actions. Nothing can give the confused man peace, nothing can give him full comfort, unless understanding itself calms him and with its enlightenment gives comfort to the man's soul. Just as the blind man does not know peace until he sees the world, so too the confused man does not know peace until he enters into understanding.[273]

For Dymytrii emotional illness and sin are closely intertwined. The emotionally troubled Gadarene suffers from a breakdown in his soul's understanding. Subsequently he falls into a debilitating emotional state of despair and confusion. At the moment of sin, the human being suffers from the disorder of his natural inclinations to reason and good judgement. Something transpires in his inward state that brings chaos and confusion to his soul's understanding. The consequence of this may become manifest in mental illness, or sin, or both.

безуміи и неразсужденіи: ниже содѣетъ что благо, точію въ разумъ, ниже что злое, аще не въ безуміи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 309.

[273] «Всякаго грѣха всегда предваряетъ безуміе, добродѣтели же и благодѣянія разумъ: не даруетъ никогдаже безуміе человѣку покоя, ниже совершеннаго утѣшенія, аще не самъ разумъ упокоитъ, и просвѣщеніемъ своимъ утѣшитъ душу. Якоже бо слѣпому не мощно имѣти покоя, донелѣ не зритъ свѣта, сице ни безумному, дондеже не пріидетъ въ разумъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 309.

The sinner is neither to judge himself nor judge others during these moments of inward confusion. Rather, it is his task to recognize that inward turmoil and misunderstanding are the forces that move him to inappropriate behavior. The Christian's ethical task is to restore reason and understanding to the troubled mind. When Dymytrii retells biblical narratives about the healing of men and women possessed by demons, it is Jesus who restores peace and calm to these troubled individuals by forgiving their sins. The act of forgiving is one of mutual cooperation. The Gadarene tormented by the demon of lust is able to understand himself clearly once God provides him with a lantern for his illumination and a mirror for his self-reflection. The Lord's act of forgiveness consists in giving the gift of self-knowledge to the troubled person, thereby restoring order and reason to the confused soul.

The idea that sin is the consequence of a failure to understand is fundamental to Dymytrii's approach to Christian ethics. Repentance and forgiveness consist of understanding oneself and understanding one's offence. In this respect sin exists in relation to the sinful man's failure to understand. It is not so much the actual misdeed that is of concern but the spiritual state of the sinner. Here Dymytrii follows an ethical tradition that dates back to the Desert Fathers. When a brother's conscience is troubled by self-accusation, Abba Poemen replies: "At the moment that a man goes astray, if he says, I have sinned, immediately the sin ceases."[274] Likewise in Dymytrii's sermons there is not so much an emphasis on accusation and punishment for misdeeds, but on the natural desire of human beings to understand themselves, to recognize their mistakes and to correct themselves according to the reason, understanding, good judgement and free will that God has given to all.

---

[274] *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers*, trans. Benedicta Ward (London and Oxford: Mowbray and Cistercian Publications, 1975) 181.

In all of Dymytrii's healing sermons the role of language is central. The act of speaking is fundamentally an ethical response by the reasoning soul in its desire to establish meaning in the created world. The healthy soul uses good judgement and understanding to order the world that surrounds it through language. Poor judgement and misunderstanding bring chaos, disorder and sin to the world. More importantly, human beings use language to order the invisible world within them and the well-being of this interior space depends on their ability to articulate the soul's desires and thoughts through prayer. Speech without faith and without virtuous living, is nothing but outward dumbness and confusion. Prayer without meaning and without mindful attentiveness is nothing but inward dumbness and empty noise. Language is above all else an ethical act of based on reason and correct judgement. and prayer is the highest and most important use of language. The acquisition and use of language must go hand in hand with the study of ethics, for if a man's judgement is clouded by sin, then his speech likewise will be darkened by obscurity:

> Before all things and in all things let true understanding and good judgement always anticipate and walk before you: and at no time will you be deceived, but rather you shall be delivered from all kinds of deception. Just as external objects cannot be seen except with the eyes, so too, the inner spiritual things cannot be comprehended except with understanding and with intellectual examination.[275]

The purpose of Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* is to guide his readers along the path of spiritual perception and in this respect he is expressing a basic philosophic concern that dates back to Plato's *Republic*. In the *Republic* Plato warns his students that if they rely only on their physical perceptions, they will lack wisdom and be unable to understand that which is truly before them. Dymytrii likewise warns his readers that deception awaits all who are unable to perceive inwardly using the eyes of understanding.

---

[275] «Пред всѣми вещьми и во всѣхъ вещехъ да предваряетъ и предходитъ пред тобою всегда правъ разумъ и разсужденіе: и никогдаже ни въ чемъ прельстишися, но паче всѣхъ прелестей пребывше будеши. Якоже внѣшнія вся вещи не могутъ быти зримы, точію очима: сице ниже внутренняя духовная могутъ быти разумѣнна, точію разумомъ и умнымъ разсмотреніемъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 308.

The acquisition of inward understanding and spiritual perception, however, is no easy accomplishment. A Christian philosopher, Dymytrii maintains that prayer is the only means by which true light and knowledge may be acquired:

> Do not commence anything, nor do anything, until you have united with God in prayer. Think on this: only correct understanding and good judgement together can make a man untouched and unafraid in all things. "Meditate in all things that you do," says the Lord to Joshua (Josh. 1.8)[276]

It is important to keep in mind that judgement is the essential quality that governs the process of rhetorical *dispositio*. When arranging his speech, the rhetorician must decide what to put in and what to leave out. Dymytrii reminds his readers that they are all called to become good rhetoricians, or arrangers, of their lives:

> For this reason let all virtuous men honor understanding and good judgement: these are the beginning and cause of every good thing. Accordingly, a virtuous man cannot be virtuous unless good judgement and understanding assist him and direct him in his works.[277]

Thus, Dymytrii reminds his readers that the act of *dispositio* always carries ethical implications: if human beings are to become virtuous, they must have good judgement. Conversely, if they lack inward order and understanding, then they are incapable of virtuous living. At the same time, virtue is something that cannot be intellectualized, for it requires works and good deeds. Thus the inward disposition of the soul is reflected in the outward disposition of men's daily lives: if they are well-ordered and harmonious within, then they will interact with others and the world around them in a manner that reflects their inward calm and balance.

---

[276] «Да не начинаеши, ниже что когда дѣеши, дондеже Богу молитвою соединяяйся, разсудиши: ничтоже бо сице во всѣхъ вещехъ непреткновенна и непоползновенна человѣка творити обыче, якоже правъ разумъ и разсужденіе. Да смыслиши о всѣхъ, яже аще дѣеши, рече ко Іисусу Навіну Господь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 308. The Authorized (King James) Version of Josh. 1.8 is "Thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest."

[277] «Тѣмже паче всѣхъ добродѣтелеи да предпочтени будутъ, разумъ и разсужденіе: се бо есть начало и вина всему благому. Ни бо добродѣтель добродѣтелію, яко подобаетъ, быти можетъ, аще разсужденіе и разумъ спомогателенъ и преводителенъ дѣлу не будетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 309–10.

The Soul's Disposition and the World: The Five Senses

The interaction between the soul's inward disposition and the world that surrounds it is an ethical task that requires intermediaries in order to accomplish it. The five senses serve as portals through which the soul perceives the outside world and through which the outside world's sensibilities leave their imprint upon the soul. Dymytrii reminds his readers of the parallel relationship between the outward sensibilities of the flesh senses and the inward sensibilities of the soul:

> Among all the natural sensibilities, sight is the most treasured and the most joyful to the sighted, so too among the intellectual and understandable [sensibilities], reason is the most honorable and most comforting. This is eternal life and the other is a falling away and a succumbing to languor.[278]

A humanist, Dymytrii is delighted to see hierarchy among man's sensibilities: sight is most honorable and joyful of the outward sensibilities; reason is most honorable and most comforting of the intellectual sensibilities The tradition of giving sight the highest importance among the five senses is an ancient one, going back to Aristotle, who explained that "sight is in its own nature more valuable with a view to the necessities of life."[279] Aristotle, however, also believed that hearing is more conducive to knowledge. Dymytrii most likely follows the Classical tradition of assigning man's ears the second position in the hierarchy following the eyes, for hearing enables the human being to enter into conversation with God through prayer. Just as Aristotle believed that hearing is more conducive to knowledge, Dymytrii cites prayer—its words and its sounds—as the sensible act that brings the human being into union with God. Here Dymytrii echoes a tradition going back to early Christianity: Lactanius exalted hearing as the sense that is conducive to faith, for it is the hearing that receives spiritual instruction and accepts the Divine Word.[280] Dymytrii, however, accords hearing its high honor on account of its role in communication: as a grammarian and rhetorician he is aware of this sense's pivotal function in the act of speaking. The human being's outward hearing—i.e., his ears—governs the art of exterior communication, language. The human being's inward hearing—i.e., the sensibility that is possessed by the soul—governs the art of inward dialogue, prayer.

---

[278] «Якоже всѣхъ естественыхъ чувствъ честнѣйшее и радостнѣйшее есть въ видимыхъ зрѣніе, сице и въ мысленныхъ разумѣваемыхъ честнѣйшій и утѣшнѣйшій есть разумъ, и всѣхъ вещей познаніе: се бо есть и животъ вѣчный, се же и отпаденіе, и пріятіе томленія»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 310.

Dymytrii, however, like all other neo-Platonists, advises caution when dealing with the senses: if sight and hearing are the senses most vital to the human being's inward sensibility, then he must be especially careful to maintain vigilance over these gateways to his soul. The eyes can serve as conduits to Divine truth, but they can also serve as entry points for sin—lust, greed, envy, anger and so on. With his hearing the Christian may indeed enter into a meaningful dialogue with God, but he may also fall into sinful conversation—

---

[279] Vinge 18.
[280] Vinge 128.

words of false witness, slander and other evil sounds may be produced by his tongue. Hence, emphasis must be placed on the soul's inward sensibilities, that they not be subverted by sin. Man's inward eyes must be always on guard that he does not allow evil to enter his vision. His inward ears must be attentive, at all times censuring the sounds that come from his lips, so that these utterances be good and virtuous and not evil.

The complex relationship between the five senses and the soul is the subject of the fourth chapter of this thesis, "*Memoria Spiritualis.*" But regarding the soul's *dispositio*, it is important to keep in mind that the soul's relationship to the five senses is part of the soul's larger and more complex relationship to the body. The harmony and balance of the inward person and the peace and good order of the individuals' relationship with the world surrounding him, are entirely dependent on a much more fundamental relationship, that of the soul and the body. For Dymytrii, the body-soul relationship is one of essential paradox and mystery. The body and soul's love and mutual respect for one other, on the one hand and their often stormy and difficult marriage, on the other, are a mystery that constitutes the very paradox of human existence. To explore this mystery a map of the soul—or an anatomy—is essential. Just as physicians use a medical anatomy to map the order and arrangement of the physical body, Dymytrii, as spiritual physician, maps out the human soul, its sensibility and its intimate relationship with her companion in life, the body.

The Anatomy of the Soul: Dymytrii's Sermon on the Last Judgement

In the tradition of seventeenth-century thinkers, including John Donne, Dymytrii provides his readers with an anatomy of the human soul. It is found in his "Sermon for the Fourth Sunday After Pascha: The Healing of the Paralytic." The theme of this sermon is from John 5.14: "Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee." This sermon was preached on the fourth week following Easter, and Dymytrii makes reference to the Lenten period of fasting and penance preceding the Christian Pascha. The central idea of the sermon is that of vigilance: having repented and confessed during the Great Fast, the listener is reminded that although it is an evil thing to sin once or twice, it is far more evil to return to the same sin after having repented of it.

> It is evil to sin once or twice; it is indeed worse to repeat the same guilty crime after having once repented of it. Often, a repeated transgression does not just weaken the soul, but kills her. Not only does she fall into an evil pit, but she is entirely buried. Not only is she wounded, but she is slain. Not only is she harmed, but she is destroyed.[281]

Thus Dymytrii begins his sermon with the ethical concern for the soul's well-being. In the moral battle between sin and virtue the stakes are high indeed, for it is the soul's very existence that is at stake: a repeated fall into sin and transgression condemns the soul to spiritual death and obscurity:

> Just as the human face becomes disfigured from any kind of wound or deformity, in the same manner the understanding becomes unintelligible when after repentance a man returns to his sin. In this manner a man becomes a thoughtless beast, rather than a understanding human being.[282]

A pastor, Dymytrii is not concerned with the sinful deed itself, but with the emotional state that drives a person along the path of poor judgement and misunderstanding that is the cause of all sin. In terms of pastoral theology, it is important to note that Dymytrii is not speaking about an occasional lapse in judgement, but a habitual, compulsive choice of evil over good. It is the compulsiveness of such spiritual disorders that indicates deeper, more troubling emotional concerns that require spiritual diagnosis.

---

[281] «Зло есть, еже единою, или дважды согрѣшити: горшее же есть, еже выну и по покаяніи таяжде дѣяти: частѣ бо повторяемый грѣхъ не точію разслабляеть душу, но и уморяеть ю: не точію въ яму лютейшую падаеть, но и перстію отчаянія засыпаеть: не точію язвить, но и убиваеть: не точію вредить, но и погубляеть»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 187.

[282] «Якоже лице человѣческое безобразуется от пріятыя на себе каковыя язвы, или проказы: сице разумъ обезразумляется от возвращенія на грѣхъ по покаяніи и человѣкъ содѣлывается не человѣкъ разумный, но скотъ немысленный»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 188–89.

The diagnostician of the soul, like that of the body, requires an anatomy to guide him in matters of internal arrangement. Hence, Dymytrii asks his readers to turn their attention to the composition of the soul:

> Our invisible soul has its exterior and it has its interior. The soul's understanding is like a countenance visible to all. A man's wisdom shines upon his face (Eccles. 8.1). An understanding man is recognizable from his speech, his virtues, his deeds—this is the exterior of the soul. The soul's conscience is its interior, visible to no one. A man approaches, his heart is heavy and following repentance the man returns to his previous iniquity and he falls into such great evil that it impairs his sight, the exterior of his soul and its interior, his understanding, I say and his conscience.[283]

This anatomy of the soul reveals the neo-Platonic sources of Dymytrii's spiritual understanding. Just like the human body has an exterior and an interior, the body's companion, the soul, also possesses an exterior and an interior. The soul's exterior consists of its rational component—its understanding. The soul's interior is its conscience. Always the good philologist, Dymytrii is quick to note subject-verb agreement in all things spiritual. And indeed, a kind of grammatical agreement exists between the soul's two components and the two types of actions manifested by them: the exterior component (reason) governs outward actions (good deeds), whereas the interior component (conscience) governs inward actions (repentance).

---

[283] «Душа наша невидимая имать свою внѣшность, имать свою и внутренность. Разумъ въ душѣ есть яко лице всѣми зримое, мудрость человѣка сіяетъ на лицѣ его, познавается бо разумный человѣкъ от бесѣды, от нрава, от дѣяній его, то внѣшность душевная: совѣсть же въ душѣ, есть то внутренность ея, никимже зримая. Преступитъ человѣкъ, и сердце глубоко, возвращаяйся же человѣкъ по покаяніи на первая своя беззаконія, въ толь веліе зло впадаетъ, яко вредитъ въ себѣ окое, и внѣшность душевную, и внутренность, разумъ, глаголю, и совѣсть»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 188. The Authorized (King James) Version of Eccles. 8.1 reads: "Who is as the wise man? and who knoweth the interpretation of a thing? a man's wisdom maketh his face to shine and the boldness of his face shall be changed."

A similar anatomy of the soul exists in another of Dymytrii's Sermons, for the Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost. In this sermon Dymytrii takes the parable of the householder and the vineyard (Matt. 21.33–44), reduces it to its essential elements and gives the following symbolic associations for each of the components:

1. vineyard = the human soul;
2. fruit = fear of God;
3. winepress = the human heart that presses with loving kindness;
4. tower = the Cross commemorating Christ's suffering;
5. husbandmen = the soul's powers (Slavonic: *dushevnyia sily*);
    a) memory;
    b) understanding;
    c) free will;
6. servants = the five senses;
7. son of the householder = Jesus Christ;[284]

We see here a further distinction of the soul's outward and inward properties. Along with understanding, the soul's exterior husbandmen include the memory and free will. A neo-Platonist, Dymytrii sees man's memory integrally connected to his five senses; hence, it is proper that he assigns memory to the exterior of the soul along with its understanding.[285] Free will joins the understanding and the memory as the third husbandman of the soul's exterior. Free will entails choices between virtuous deeds and evil; therefore, it is dependent upon the soul's interaction with the world and is so accorded its place in the soul's exterior.

---

[284] «Бо особности же, віноградомъ есть всякая душа Хрістіанская правовѣрнаго и благочестиваго человѣка: оплотъ, страхъ Божіи: точило, сердце, точащее умиленіе: столпъ, крестъ, всегдашнее памятствованіе страданія Хрістова: дѣлатели, душевныя силы, память, разумъ и воля: рабы, чувства: наслѣдник же того вінограда и тойже Хрістосъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 434.

[285] See chapter four, "*Memoria Spiritualis.*"

Although they are separated into the two domains of the soul's exterior and interior, understanding and conscience are clearly connected. In the Gadarene narrative from the St. Michael Sermon the possessed man demonstrates a lack of shame. The reason he is not ashamed of his sinful behavior is that he does not understand. Reason has deserted his sick soul and so he has no conscience. Hence the seven angels intervene to restore his balance and reason and at the same moment the Gadarene changes his behavior. Like Adam and Eve becoming ashamed only upon the awareness of their nakedness, the soul's interior conscience depends upon its exterior knowledge and understanding.

The Anatomy of a Disfigured Understanding: the Idol of Dagon

Having described the anatomy of the healthy soul, the sermon on the Healing of the Paralytic continues its spiritual diagnosis by examining the unhealthy soul, whose understanding is impaired and thereby driven to sin. For an inventive source, Dymytrii turns to the biblical narrative concerning the idol of Dagon from the first book of Samuel (1 Sam. 5.2–4). The original text is as follows:

> When the Philistines took the ark of God, they brought it into the house of Dagon and set it by Dagon.
>
> And when they of Ashdod arose early on the morrow, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face to the earth before the ark of the Lord. And they took Dagon and set him in his place again.
>
> And when they arose early on the morrow morning, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face to the ground before the ark of the Lord; and the head of Dagon and both the palms of his hands were cut off upon the threshold; only the stump of Dagon was left to him.

In the Slavonic Bible and in Dymytrii's re-telling of this narrative, the reference is not to Dagon's stump, but to his spine: "And only the spine of Dagon was left standing in place" (2: 189: «токмо хребетъ Дагоновъ оста на мѣсте свое»). In the Hebrew original, however, there is no mention of either the stump in the King James version or the spine in the Slavonic Bible. Dymytrii is aware of this. Always a good philologist, Dymytrii eschews the Slavonic text and instead refers his readers directly to the Hebrew original:

> Thus it is written in the scriptures: only the spine of Dagon was left standing. The Hebrew Bible reads: only Dagon was left standing. What does this mean: "only Dagon was left standing?" Dagon, according to the explanation of certain people, was part fish: he was an idol in the image of a fish with a human head and hands and when, on his second fall, his head and hands were severed, all that was left was the form of a fish.[286]

The "certain people" referred to above likely includes St. Jerome, the Church Father who proposed the idea that Dagon was a fish god.[287] Dymytrii explains the spiritual and ethical implications of the Dagon narrative as follows:

> Here begins our discussion: A man falls into a certain sin for the first time. However, he has not been utterly broken, as long as there is hope of getting up, as long as the Lord's hand guides him and strengthens him, for as it is written in scriptures: "for though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down, for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand" (Ps. 37.24) "for the Lord is able to make him stand" (Rom. 14.4). Then, having stood himself up by means of holy repentance, in his proper place, that is, before God's tabernacle, before God's grace, the man falls again and again returns to his earlier iniquity, then at that moment his fall becomes incomparably more terrible, for he has lost his head: his healthy understanding; and he is without the hands of understanding deeds and the face

---

[286] «То слово въ писаніи: Токмо хребетъ Дагоновъ оста. Еврейска Біблія четъ: Токмо Дагон оста. Чтоже сіе есть, токмо Дагонъ оста; Дагонъ, по толкованію нѣкіихъ, тожде есть, еже и рыба: бяше бо ідолъ, рыбѣ подобенъ, имѣяй главу человѣчу и руцѣ, и егда отсѣкошася ему вторымъ падежемъ глава и руцѣ, оста токмо подобіе рыбы»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 189–90.

[287] See Frank Montalbano, "Canaanite Dagon: Origin, Nature," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 13 (1951): 394. It is quite possible that Jerome's interpretation came to Dymytrii via Cornelius a Lapide's commentary on 1 Samuel.

> of his soul in numerous ways becomes disfigured before God and men: his affliction not only angers God, but it is an offence to people through his condemnation and derision of others and his demeanor. He is without the former beauty of his good deeds, like a face without beauty. Without his understanding of Divine contemplation, he is like without a head. Without good deeds, he is like without hands and he is unable to tear himself away from sinful ways and in all ways he has become a slave and no longer does as he wishes, but follows the desires of the sin that dwells within him.[288]

Thus, following the example of Dagon, the sin and unhappiness that the human being introduces into his life is a matter of losing his head figuratively. The danger of repeated sin is in accordance with a pedagogical principle, the more a person practises something the more adept he becomes at it.

Furthermore the example of Dagon's idol illustrates Dymytrii's emphasis on the social context of virtuous living. Sin is not simply a personal matter between man and God but an offence to society. The sinful man, like Dagon's idol, may indeed be close to God and continually standing in his presence. He may indeed be repentant of his transgression and possessing a firm intention to stand himself up straight. All this, however, is of no avail unless he brings order to his soul's understanding through acts of charity. To keep the soul's reason in order, it is necessary that the Christian occupy his hands with appropriate deeds at all times, for if the constant flow between wisdom and good works is disrupted, the soul's face—its understanding—becomes disfigured in a multitude of ways before God and men.

---

[288] «Здѣ бесѣдѣ нашей изявленіе.
Падаетъ человѣкъ единою въ нѣкій тяжкій грѣхъ, еще не вконецъ сокрушился, еже есть надежда востанія, еще рука Господня воздвигнетъ, подкрѣпитъ его, по писанному: аще и падетъ, не разбіется, яко Господь подкрѣпляетъ руку его: Силенъ бо есть Богъ поставити его. Потомъ поставленъ уже бывшій чрез святое покаяніе на своемъ мѣстѣ, якоже при ківотѣ, при первой Божіей благодати, егда паки падетъ, егда на первое паки возвратится беззаконіе, тогда уже несоравненно бываетъ лютѣйшее его то паденіе, ибо погубляетъ яко главу, разумъ здравый, и яко руцѣ дѣяніе разума, и уже душевное его лице попремногу безобразуется пред Богом и человѣки: не точію бо горѣе прогнѣваетъ Бога, но и въ соблазнь людемъ бываетъ, во осужденіе же, въ смѣхъ, и въ поношеніе: и бываетъ без первыя своея добродѣтельныя красоты, яко без красоты лица: без разума же богомысленнаго, яко без главы; а без добрыхъ дѣлъ, яко без рукъ, не могіи отятися грѣховному обычаю, но всячески порабощенъ ему, и уже не еже онъ хощетъ, сіе творитъ, не еже не хочетъ, сіе содѣваетъ, не онъ, но живый въ немъ грѣхъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 190.

Harmony and discord between soul and body: The Sermon on the Last Judgement

Social decorum and good deeds, however, cannot be accomplished by the soul on its own, for the soul requires a body in order to carry out these tasks. Hence the soul's inward disposition between the understanding and the conscience is dependent upon the outward harmony between the soul itself and the body. If the union between body and soul is harmonious, together they will yield the fruits of good deeds and virtue. If the union is discordant, then the marriage between body and soul will be poisonous, bringing forth evil and vice.

Dymytrii's Sermon for the Sunday of Last Judgement contains a dramatic dialogue between two characters named Body and Soul. The background to this spoken dialogue is the Resurrection of the dead on judgement day. Angels sound their trumpets and the souls of the dead are reunited with their bodies:

> At his second earthly coming, Christ our God will come in glory. The first thing that will be heard before his arrival will be the voice of the archangels' trumpets, sounding throughout the world, calling all people to judgement and commanding all the dead to rise from their graves. The trumpets trumpet, "and the dead rise, never to die again" (I Cor. 15.52).[289]

---

[289] «Во второе свое на землю пришествіе, Хрісту Богу нашему славно пріити имущему, вопервыхъ услышится предидущимъ ему гласъ трубы Архаггелскія, по вселеннѣй гласящія, всѣхъ на судъ призывающія, и мертвыхъ от гробовъ возставляющія, и мертвыхъ от гробовъ возсталвяющія: Вострубитъ бо, и мертвіи востанутъ нетлѣнни»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 14.

Note the sensibilities: "The first thing we *hear* is the *voice* that announces . . . the *voice* of the archangels' trumpets, *sounding* . . . *calling* all people to judgement . . . ." The body reacts to sound: the dead rise from the grave. Thus Dymytrii reminds his readers that the body is entirely dependent upon its five senses in order to respond to God's call.

Dymytrii's sermon presents a resurrection of the dead body and soul that demonstrates the restoration of all three parts of the neo-Platonic tripartite soul. On the first level we see the restoration of the vegetative soul in this process—dead things are not alive and life is proper to the vegetative soul. On the second level we see the restoration of the second Platonic element, the animative soul that is restored to the dead body on judgement day. Just as life is proper to the vegetative soul, quickness is proper to the animative soul. The bodies of the dead become quick and move at the sound of the trumpets, thus demonstrating the return of the vegetative and the animative principles to the human flesh.

At the same moment, another soul quality is restored to the human being—the sensibility of emotion:

> Here will be the first great terror of sinners, as the trumpet sounds, sending each soul back to her body. To her body, a body reduced to dust and soil, completely disintegrated. By the will of God she is sent back to her former composition to reclaim her bodily members.[290]

Here, Dymytrii reverses a wheat metaphor, following the biblical example of John 12.24. Instead of using wheat to communicate the usual notions of wealth, prosperity, abundance, he extends it in reverse and reminds his readers that death and decay are necessary before the process of revitalization can take place:

---

[290] «Здѣ вопервыхъ страхъ веліи будетъ грѣшнымъ, егда гласъ трубный повелитъ коеждо душѣ въ свое внити тѣло: въ тѣло, еже въ прахъ и въ персть вѣ обращенно, и весма уничтоженно, а тогда повелѣніемъ Божіимъ паки въ свой первобытный составъ пріидетъ своя члены возметъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 14.

> When a grain of wheat is planted in the earth it decays. And then, in its time, it sends forth a stalk and then a spike and then yields fruit according to our Lord's words: "A grain of wheat remains no more than a single grain unless it is dropped into the ground and dies. But when it dies, it produces much fruit." (John 12.24) In the same manner, when the trumpets sound, the human body, after lying dead and decaying in the earth, will suddenly feel the return of life's vigor, as its soul will returns to its former dwelling, making it alive.[291]

The vegetative and animative soul having been restored to the body, Dymytrii then focuses on the sensibility that accompanies the return of the animative principle to the human being:

> At that moment, I declare, there will be terror unto the sinful soul, as the body is reunited unto her, having been released from the darkness of the earth and the bonds of death. But when she approaches her body, she beholds that he is not as she knew him in life, but changed. In life he was handsome, well-built, with a beautiful face and delightful. But now he is deformed, ugly, monstrous, corrupt, abominable and frightful—a veritable thing of terror.[292]

Thus Dymytrii shows that the soul's response is one of sensibility: she perceives the ugliness of the decayed body. The soul's emotional response to the sight of this ugliness is terror. The sensibility of this response is two-fold. Firstly, the soul looks at the body in the present moment and she sees that he appears ugly. Secondly, on the sensible level of imagination, she recollects that the body used to appear beautiful. Thus, two sensible responses, one of sight and the second of the imagination (i.e., recollection of sight), bring the soul to a state of distress. The ugliness of the sight of decayed flesh is doubly disturbing when she remembers how beautiful the body used to be.

---

[291] «Якоже бо сѣмя, въ землю посѣянное, аще и истлѣваетъ: обаче въ свое ему время прозябаетъ, и возращаетъ первѣе траву, таже класъ, и плодъ приноситъ, по словеси Господню: Аще зерно пшенично падши на землю не умретъ, то едино пребываетъ: аще же умретъ, многъ плодъ сотворитъ: сице и тѣло человѣческое умершее и истлѣвшее и въ прахъ бывшее, единнѣмъ часомъ от гласа трубы пріиметъ силу ращенія своего, и въ первобытіе свое пріидетъ, и душею своею оживотворится»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 14–15.

[292] «Въ той время будетъ, глаголю, страхъ душѣ грѣшной, от темницъ адовыхъ и от узъ смертныхъ къ тѣлу, еже соединитися съ нимъ, отпущенной. Егда бо приступитъ къ тѣлу своему, узритъ то не яково прежде въ жизни сей бѣ, но отмѣнитое. Въ жизни сей бѣ лѣпотно, доброзрачно, краснолично, любезно: а тогда будетъ безобразно, нелѣпо, скаредно, гнусно, мерзостно и ужасно, аки нѣкое страшилище»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 15.

Dymytrii's Baroque fascination with the repulsiveness of decayed flesh at the same time resonates with the eighth-century Byzantine anthem of St. John of Damascus, sung at Orthodox funerals:

> I weep and I wail when I think upon death and behold our beauty, fashioned after the image of God, lying in the tomb disfigured, dishonored, bereft of form. O marvel! What is this mystery which doth befall us? Why have we been given over unto corruption and why have we been wedded unto death?[293]

In Dymytrii's sermon death and decay are unnatural and the corrupt body's ugly appearance disturbs the soul. Here we see Dymytrii's neo-Platonic understanding of the soul's disposition. Seventeenth-century Europeans considered emotion a sensible phenomenon—a psychological (i.e., the soul) and physiological (i.e., the body) response to sensory information.[294] Dymytrii's soul on Judgement Day beholds the body's ugliness with her eyes; she is revolted and desires to flee from his presence.

The idea that ugliness troubles the soul carries the reverse corollary that beauty brings delight to the soul. Dymytrii's next sentence affirms that the living flesh is a delight to look upon and that it is the soul that finds sensible delight in physical beauty. And at this point Dymytrii moves his readers to another aspect of the body-soul relationship—that the relationship between body and soul is erotic, for it is proper that they should take delight in one another.

---

[293] *Service Book of the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church*, trans. Isabel Hapgood (Englewood: Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of North America, 1975) 386.

[294] See the chapter entitled "Instruction and Delight in Art" in H. James Jensen, 24–46. Jensen particularly underlines the distinction that seventeenth-century artists made between those perceptions that give delight to the sensible soul and those that merely arouse passions and appetites.

> His face, that in the previous life was a delight to behold and well-suited for flirting and enticing and exciting the passions of love, is now charred by the fire and soot of hell. Wherever there is but a little bit of blackened flesh still attached to his face, like freckles, upon there sit the most evil and horrific toads, who unceasingly and insufferably eat away at him. The handsome, arched eyebrows, that were such a delight in moments of seduction and love making, are now like the eyes of a dragon, swollen and popped out from the fires of hell. The lips, that used to kiss the most sensuous kisses, boils with a worm that does not sleep. The tongue, that used to utter obscene words, is now like carbon, a piece of iron charred by the fire. And all the decayed, rotting wounds, all the blackened body, all the way up to his charred head, bearing the evidence of his hellish sufferings, like a living hell itself—is beheld by the sinful soul. She is alarmed and begins to fear her former body, he is like a fiery punishment. She loathes him and is disgusted by him: he has been transformed into an unbearable abomination. She desires to flee from him.
>
> Commanded by God's will, the soul returns to her revolting and frightful body. At one time she did not want to leave him, for he was her friend and companion from birth.[295]

---

[295] «Лице, въ жизни сей писавшееся на прельщеніе, тогда будетъ смолою и пекломъ горящимъ очерненно: а идѣже на лицѣ бяху нѣкія черныя малыя пластыри, глаголемыя мушки, на тѣхъ мѣстѣхъ сядутъ скаредныя страшныя жабы, нестерпимо и непрестанно грызущыя. Очи высокобровіи, яже исполненніи бяху любодѣянія и прелести, тогда будутъ аки очи зміины, огнъ испущающіи. Уста блудолобзательная воскипятъ неусыпаемъ червіемъ. Языкъ сквернословный будетъ тогда яко жаратокъ или желѣзо бъ огнѣ разженно, и вся уды сквернавы, мерзски, все тѣло черно, аки главня ожженно, прежде вверженія во адъ уже адскихъ мукъ начатки носящее, и аки живый адъ сущее, еже узрѣвши грѣшная душа, начнетъ ужасатися тѣла своего, яко огненнаго мучилища, и гнушатися, яко мерзости нестерпимой, и трепетати, не хотящи внити въ не: обаче и нехотящая внидетъ.

Внидетъ душа, Божіимъ велѣніемъ убѣжденая, въ мерзостное и страшное свое тѣло, от негоже первѣе разлучитися не хотяше, соединитися съ нимъ не якоже первѣе съ купнороднымъ своимъ другомъ, но яко съ ненавидимымъ врагомъ, съ смердящнимъ, червми ядомымъ псомъ, и съ зміинымъ яда исполненымъ трупомъ: тогда начнетъ едино другому досаждати, едино другаго окаевати, проклинати»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 15–16.

In the corrupt state of death and sin, however, there is of course no delight between the body and the soul, but antagonism. In this section we see how Dymytrii draws up an inventory of the body's features—face, eyes, lips, tongue—and elaborates upon each of them. This kind of inventory, of course, is a standard device for Renaissance love poetry.[296] Here Dymytrii reverses this topos and instead creates an inventory of decayed body parts that distress the soul's sensibilities.

Dymytrii is providing us with three important pieces of information here: firstly, that the soul is sensible and takes delight in physical beauty; secondly, that the relationship between body and soul should be a harmonious one: they should be like lovers. But thirdly, he makes it clear that this harmonious union between body and soul can be disturbed. And the effects of this disharmony, are terrible and dismaying. The two lines that conclude this idea underline the frightful discord that exists between the sinful soul and body on the day of judgement:

> But now he is a hated enemy, a stinking, worm-eaten dog, a worm-eaten carcass. At this point the soul and the body become annoyed with each other. And they start to revile and curse one another.[297]

The soul's sensibilities having been fully restored and indeed being completely alarmed by the ugliness of decomposed flesh, Dymytrii then focuses on the highest principle of the soul—its reason and understanding. A dialogue unfolds, in which two characters, named Body and Soul engage in what amounts to a kind of forensic debate, attempting to determine who is to blame for the present misfortune.

---

[296] The most well-known example in English literature is, of course, Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*. See William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Abbey Library, 1977) 1041–52.

[297] «. . . но яко съ ненавидимымъ врагомъ, съ смердящнимъ, червми ядомымъ псомъ, и съ зміинымъ яда исполненымъ трупомъ: тогда начнетъ едино другому досаждати, едино другаго окаевати, проклинати»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 16.

> Says the soul to the body:
>
> "Damn you, you cursed body! Your insatiable appetite for sinful pleasures tempted me and your wicked lawlessness led me astray."
>
> Says the body to the soul:
>
> "Damn you, you cursed soul of mine! You failed to control my appetites. God gave you reason and understanding, like a bit and bridle, with which you were to guide me. In all things you were supposed to regulate me. If I participated in any sort of sin, it was with your consent and participation. You and I together have brought down the wrath of God our Creator."[298]

Note what has just happened: speech has been articulated. This is the first time that the two principal characters release their tongues and speak. This is not coincidental. Dymytrii has already moved his readers from the vegetative aspect of the soul (i.e., the revitalization of the dead body), to the sensible aspect of the soul (i.e., the soul's dismay—dismay, like all emotion, is a sensible thing) and now to the third and highest level of the soul: reason and understanding. The rational soul is the part of the soul that controls the act of speech, organizing sounds into words, grammar and meaningful utterances. Dymytrii's characters, named Body and Soul, are now endowed with speech. The soul moves from a sensible, emotional state of dismay, to a rational state in which she seeks to understand the present predicament in which she and her body now find themselves.

---

[298] «Реченъ душа къ тѣлу: проклято ты, окаянное тѣло, яко любосластіемъ твоимъ грѣховнымъ прелстило мя еси, и въ беззаконія лютая ввело мя еси. Реченъ тѣло къ душѣ: проклята ты окаянная душе моя, яко ты злѣ управляла мя еси, и разумомъ твоимъ, от Бога тебѣ даннымъ, аки броздами и уздою, от злыхъ дѣлъ не воздержала мя еси, но во всемъ мнѣ соизволяла еси: и аще когда возжелахъ коего грѣха, ты соизволила и содѣствовала еси: и купно прогнѣвахомъ Создателя нашего Бога»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 16.

It is significant that Dymytrii presents a *dialogue* of the soul and body and not just a monologue of the soul. In order for speech to occur, body and soul both have to participate. In Dymytrii's body-soul dialogue these two participants are equal partners. The soul needs the body's tongue, lips, etc. in order to make language. At the same time, the body needs the soul's reason and understanding in order to organize the sounds that he makes into language.

> Again, says the soul to the body:
>
> "Damn you, you cursed body! You spent your days in gluttony and drunkenness and for this God has damned me to a hellish fate."
>
> Again, says the body to the soul:
>
> "Damn you, you cursed soul of mine! You were with me from the start. Together we glutted and debauched ourselves. We both stuffed ourselves from the same plate of food and together we became drunk from the same cup of wine. You failed to instruct, not only me, but yourself, in the art of self-control."
>
> Still, the soul says to the body:
>
> "Woe to you, O cursed body of mine! You offended your neighbor, robbed, abducted strangers, stole and murdered!"
>
> The body responds, saying:
>
> "Woe to you, O cursed soul of mine! In all these things you were my accomplice. You led me to anger and rage. It was on your account that I become lazy and greedy. It was because of this that I stole from and abducted strangers. In all these things you assisted me. You were my accomplice, my mentor and my companion. All the things I did, I could not have done without your help."
>
> And so the two of them squabbled, each one flying into an furious rage against the other, each one reproaching and cursing the other, just as two dogs bound together attack each other.

> Until finally, the merciless angels appeared and led them from their grave to the place of judgement, where each man's life is judged according to his deeds.[299]

The unhappiness between these two characters is not one of natural animosity, nor is it the Soul's sensibility that is troubled here—not once in this section is her previous distress over the Body's appearance mentioned. Rather, these two characters have become conscious of their own culpability, which drives them to antagonism for one another.

This kind of antagonism based on culpability typifies Body-Soul dialogues during the Baroque.[300] What is remarkable about Dymytrii's dialogue, however, is the equality between these two characters. In English literature of the period the Body-Soul relationship mirrored that of husband and wife. The soul, with its superior reason, was assigned the masculine part of the dialogue. The body, with its fleshly temptations and desires, was assigned the feminine part. Dymytrii's dialogue, by contrast, must assign the soul the feminine part because the word for soul in Slavonic possesses feminine gender (Slavonic: *dusha*) and must therefore speak in the feminine voice.

---

[299] «Паки речетъ душа къ тѣлу своему: проклято ты, окаянное тѣло, яко обяденіемъ и піянствомъ на всякъ день отягощалося еси, и мене въ бездну адскую погрузило еси. Паки отвѣщаетъ тѣло: проклята и ты душе моя окаянная, ибо съ единаго и тогожде блюда со мною яла еди, съ единой и тояжде чаши со мною пивала еси: мене же и себе воздержанію не поучила еси.

Речетъ и еще душа: горе тебѣ окаянное тѣло мое, яко озлобляло еси ближняго, грабило, позищало чуждая, крало, и убивало. Тѣло же противу глаголетъ: горе тебѣ окаянная душе моя, яко во всемъ томъ ты споспѣшествовала ми еси: ты на гнѣвъ и ярость подвизала мя еси, да озлобляю, бію и убиваю ближняго: ты на лакомство и любомнѣніе возставала мя еси, да граблю и похищаю чуждая: ты во всемъ способствовала ми еси, во всемъ наставникъ и другъ была ми еси, и ничтоже без теве творихъ, еже творихъ

Тако обое другъ съ другомъ препирающеся, едино на другаго ярящеся, и едино другаго укоряюще и клянуще, и аки псы яры купно связаны грызущеся изыдутъ, или паче рещи, извлечени будутъ немилостивными аггелами от гроба на судъ, пріяти по дѣломъ своимъ осужденіе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 16-17.

[300] See Rosalie Osmond's second chapter ("Renaissance views of Body and Soul") particularly the two subsections concerning original sin and the roles of body and soul in actual sin (Osmond 27–33)

Also remarkable in Dymytrii's dialogue is that the body and the soul are inseparable, even before the gates of hell. Whereas medieval body-soul dialogues, such as the Vision of Philibert the Hermit, conclude with the sinful soul separated from the body and being dragged into Hellmouth,[301] Dymytrii refuses to separate the two, for theologically he adheres to the Orthodox Church's doctrine that body and soul were created inseparable. The temporary separation that occurs at death was never intended by God the Creator, for death is the unnatural consequence of sin and disobedience. As Jesus Christ has redeemed humanity from the bondage of sin, it is therefore proper that at the end of time the body and the soul remain united according to the original union that was given to them by God.

Herein lies the principal idea of Dymytrii's Last Judgement Sermon and of his anatomical approach to the soul's outward and inward arrangement as presented in the *Spiritual Alphabet*. In terms of outward arrangement the union between body and soul is to be a harmonious arrangement of mutual love and respect. He is careful to point out that sin, like virtue, is a joint action requiring full cooperation between the soul's understanding and the body's senses. Regarding inward arrangement, the soul is fully endowed with reason and sensibility, and these two faculties of the soul must be in harmonious agreement. Although the body brings sensible delight to the soul, the body's passions also have the potential to destroy the soul and her understanding, thereby sending her into darkness and obscurity.

---

[301] See the plates in Osmond 108–12.

Dymytrii's Last Judgement Sermon demonstrates how the principle of *dispositio spiritualis* is central to the author's psychology of the human being. At all times the spiritual rhetorician must concern himself with the inward arrangement of the human soul. The principles of good judgement, order, balance and proportion in rhetorical disposition constitute the same principles requisite for a full and spiritually satisfying life. The spiritual rhetorician's task is to strike balance and harmony into the invisible chaos and misunderstanding that troubles the soul in its sinful and unhappy state. Understanding the soul's inward disposition—its tripartite structure and its desire for a loving, harmonious union with the body—is essential to comprehending the mysterious hidden dynamic that moves the interior self. By bringing calm and peace to their interior selves and by allowing the soul and the body to unite with one another in a marriage based on mutual respect and love, Christians open themselves up to the fullness of God's love and grace.

Chapter Three: *Elocutio Spiritualis*

The third component of rhetoric—*elocutio*—has its spiritual equivalent in good deeds and correct behavior. While the rhetorician concerns himself with the practical, stylistic concerns of *elocutio*, the spiritual rhetorician occupies himself in the soul's task of bringing forth fruit in the form of good works and virtuous living. If rhetoric is limited to the subjects of invention and arrangement, then it remains lifeless unless speech is produced through elocution. Likewise interior knowledge without deeds remains empty and barren of fruits. Like all forms of art, inward knowledge requires physical expression—the body must be activated to produce something sensible. It is the individual Christian's good works that constitute the power and eloquence that accompany his spiritual inventiveness and good disposition.

To the rhetorician, the task of elocution involves taking his inventive sources together with his orderly disposition and then addressing the practical, stylistic concerns of producing the actual oration. The process is comparable to the painter collecting his sources, then deciding upon the arrangement of his painting and then finally beginning to paint. The act of producing the desired object is the elocution.

Quintilian:

> For the verb *eloqui* means the production and communication to the audience of all that the speaker has conceived in his mind and without this power all the preliminary accomplishments of oratory are as useless as a sword that is kept permanently concealed within its sheath. Therefore it is on this that teachers of rhetoric concentrate their attention, since it cannot possibly be acquired without the assistance of the rules of art; it is this which is the chief object of our study, the goal of all our exercises and all our efforts

> at imitation and it is to this that we devote the energies of a lifetime.[302]

Stefan Iavorsky explains that the third finger of the rhetorical hand is the middle finger of *elocutio* (Slavonic: *krasnoslovie*). The middle finger of elocution possesses the special property of holding the golden mean.[303] Hence, elocution ensures that the orator's speech possesses the qualities of fairness and balance. Rhetorically this entails knowledge of one's audience and the ability to interact with them on an appropriate stylistic level. Eloquence is a balancing act between the rhetorician's desire to speak and his audience's ability and desire to accept his words. Hence there is a constant tension between what the speaker has to say and what the listener is willing to listen to.

This idea of balance between the individual and those around him through appropriate action is the basis of Dymytrii's rhetorical approach to virtuous living. Under the alphabet verse for the letter "Ш" Dymytrii explains that the soul's wisdom must be balanced with love for others:

> Let these six-winged virtues always be companion to your soul: (1) diligence; (2) love of others; (3) patience; (4) the image of goodness; (5) reasoning; (6) and love, so that by means of them it should be proper that you raise yourself up to heaven.[304]

The result of good behavior, "that you raise yourself up to heaven," does not just mean the promise of a heavenly reward in the afterlife. Rather, Dymytrii indicates that Christians should live in this world with their hearts and minds already directed towards God. This is an important point that Dymytrii and other Christian humanists make: that the human being is already called to live in the world to come, even though his physical body is still in the world of the present.

---

[302] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8. preface 15–16 (3: 85).

[303] «Перстъ среднiи златому научаетъ средству»—Iavors'kyi 11.

[304] «Шестокрилни добродѣтели, водруженни въ души твоей всегда да будутъ: сирѣчь, усердiе, друголюбiе, терпѣнiе, образъ благъ, разсужденiе, и любовь, имже удобъ на небо возвысишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

In this respect, heaven is a state of mind: at all times and in all things, the intellect must be directed to God.

The connection between understanding and pious behavior is crucial not only to Dymytrii, but to all good rhetoricians. Throughout the Early Modern period, Aristotle's Rhetoric was always published in tandem with his Ethics.[305] For Aristotle and Cicero, it was paramount that orators be selected from among the most virtuous of citizens. Erasmus continued this theme, arguing that the study of eloquence must always be accompanied by the study of ethics.[306] The gift of eloquence must not be abused by unethical men. Knowledge and understanding must go hand in hand with ethics.

For Dymytrii and other humanists, the link between understanding and pious behavior went beyond Cicero's concern for order and harmony in civic life. Throughout Christian history, the rhetorical principles of good order and harmonious arrangement have served as models for virtuous living. The presence of good order is manifested in pious behavior, while the lack of harmony is manifested in evil. For example, in medieval European mysticism, the ability to produce music and harmony is associated with virtue; the inability to produce music is associated with evil.[307] As Cassiodorus explained, "if we perform the commandments of the creator and with proper minds obey the rules he has laid down, every word we speak, every pulsation of our veins, is related by musical rhythms to the powers of harmony . . . .If we live virtuously, we are constantly proved to be under its discipline, but when we commit injustice we are without music."[308] For the Christian humanist harmonious living, like music, carries theological and cosmological significance. Good deeds are a fundamental part of bringing order and harmony into one's life and thereby restoring the original, desirable state of God's creation.

---

[305] See Stephen Halliwell's essay, "The Challenge of Rhetoric to Political and Ethical Theory in Aristotle" in: Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, ed. *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1996) 175–205.

[306] Thomas M. Conley, *Rhetoric in the European Tradition* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990) 121.

[307] See the introductory section, entitled "Aesthetics and Theology of Music" in Barbara Newman, *Saint Hildegard of Bingen: Symphonia* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988) 19.

[308] Barbara Newman 17–27.

In part one, chapter one of the *Alphabet* Dymytrii places the connection between understanding and good behavior within the context of Adam's sin:

> The first commandment was given to Adam in paradise: to act and to obey, that is, to act with understanding, to understand well and to keep the commandments and not to stray; he [Adam] however, did not act with understanding and he did not keep the commandment. It was due to the inactivity of Adam's mind that disbelief for the first time flourished; for this reason he did not believe the God who had spoken and commanded [him].[309]

For Dymytrii there is a fundamental connection between understanding and sin. This connection is demonstrated in his healing sermons, particularly those concerning the emotional sufferings of men and women possessed by demons. The Gadarene lacks knowledge and self-awareness; therefore, the angel Gabriel provides him with a light and a mirror to supply the necessary illumination and reflection. However the healing of the soul goes hand in hand with the healing of the body. Dymytrii's interpretation of stories in which Jesus heals men and women of their physical infirmities reveals the importance of the body-soul relationship for human wellness. The healing of the paralytic is one example, for the paralysis stories of the Bible are not simply about the paralysis of the body, but the paralysis of the mind. Mental dullness and inactivity lead to mental disorder and mental disorder and confusion impair the mind's judgement and lead to sin. Dymytrii reminds his readers that sin is nothing other than a manifestation of misunderstanding and poor judgement.

---

[309] «Первѣйшая Адаму въ раи бысть заповѣдь, еже дѣлати и хранити, сирѣчь, дѣлати разумомъ, еже разумѣти добрѣ, и хранити заповѣданіе еже непреступати: но понеже не дѣлаше разумомъ, сего ради не сохрани заповѣданія. От недѣланія бо умнаго первѣе возрасте вь Адамѣ невѣріе, во еже не вѣровати Богу, иже рече и заповѣда»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293–94.

Dymytrii, however, offers the solution to this spiritual, intellectual and physical malady. If misunderstanding is cause of sin, then reason is the path by which the human being returns to a virtuous life:

> It was for no other reason that Adam fell away from God and his grace, other than his misunderstanding; on this account, there is no other way to return to him, except through reason. He who knows truth, knows God; he who knows God, knows himself. He is at one with God, he is esteemed on account of all his deeds and labors; he enters into God's sanctuary and through his mind at all times he offers to God a spiritual servitude.[310]

In these remarks we see that Dymytrii's remedy for the sinful state of the human being consists of reason, understanding, self-knowledge and good deeds. When a man's reason brings him to an understanding of truth, at the same time he acquires knowledge of God. Knowledge of God is accompanied by knowledge of one's self. In this respect, Dymytrii considers the sinful man to be not only in a state of estrangement from God, but also estrangement from his own self. When a man acts sinfully, he is truly "not being himself." For the "self" is the goodness and the order that God breathes into the human being at the moment of creation. The tragic state of the sinful man is that he does not know God, nor does he recognize his own natural goodness and value as a child of God.

Dymytrii's emphasis on good works reveals much about the sources of his Christian philosophy. In the pagan tradition of neo-Platonism and neo-

---

[310] «Якоже не иною виною отпаде Адамъ от Бога и его благодати, точію безуміемъ: сице не инѣмъ чимъ паки кто присоеднитися ему, точію разумомъ, и всѣхъ вещей познаніемъ. Познавый бо кто истинною себе, позна Бога, и познавый Бога, позна себе: съ Богомъ соединенъ есть, и почивъ от всѣхъ дѣлъ и трудовъ своихъ, вниде бо святилище Божіе, и приноситъ Богу всегда умную духа службу»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 294.

Pythagoreanism good works were essential to the individual's progress toward mystical union with the One. As Johanna Drucker explains, ". . . both neo-Platonism and neo-Pythagoreanism made use of the theories of cosmological structure, harmony and symbolism which had emerged in the classical period. They also were both theurgical practices, combining contemplation, ritual magic, disciplined habits and good works in the formation of a route to divine salvation."[311] Of course, the neo-Platonists and Neo-Pythagoreans were not the only classical philosophers to place emphasis on good works: the Stoics and the Epicureans had similar concerns. Stoicism advocated a lifestyle based on public service and good deeds for the benefit of society, and Cicero advocated a philosophy of life based on politics and civic duty.[312] Indeed, Stoic influences, transmitted via the neo-Ciceronian models that dominated rhetoric during the seventeenth century, doubtless played their role in Dymytrii's intellectual development. But what marks Dymytrii's Christian philosophy as neo-Platonic is his belief that good works speed the human being along the path to salvation. Rather than a Ciceronian identification of good works with civic duty, Dymytrii tells readers that a far more important prize is at hand: acts of charity and kindness are requisite for union with God.

In this respect Dymytrii follows a patristic tradition whereby man, as image of God, is lord of creation and a microcosm that unites the intelligible and sensible aspects of creation. God has given man "the task and function to make this unity more perfect, especially after the Fall, when the forces of disintegration and division are also actively at work in creation."[313] Hence, the goodness and harmonious order of the human being's natural disposition is manifested in his benevolent and virtuous interaction with the world around him. The individual Christian's good works serve the cosmological purpose of restoring God's creation to its intended state of beauty and good order.

---

[311] Drucker 85.

[312] See: D. W. Hamlyn, "Greek Philosophy after Aristotle" in *A Critical History of Western Philosophy*, ed. D. O'Connor (London: Free Press, 1964) 71–72.

[313] Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology* 142.

It is important to keep in mind that this philosophical discussion of good works was central to the Reformation movement throughout Europe. Emphasis on good works was part of the Catholic response to Martin Luther's *sola fide* — i.e., justification by faith alone. But Dymytrii's religious philosophy based on charity and good deeds has little in common with the Roman Catholic practice of indulgences. Unlike the legalistic definitions of post-Reformation Catholicism, with its carefully defined categories of plenury and nonplenury indulgences (with the benefit of these acts applied against temporal, purgatorial, eternal punishments), Dymytrii's idea of good works is clearly in the spirit of early Christianity with its strong sense of communal responsibility.[314] Good works do not alleviate punishment in the after-life, for it is God alone who will judge men and he will reward or punish them accordingly. For Dymytrii, as for any other Christian neo-Platonist, acts of charity are beneficial to spiritual growth, for they draw human beings closer to God in a loving union.

For Dymytrii, union with God consists in a oneness of will. Christians act as one with God by placing self-interest behind them and instead desiring the will of the Father. Dymytrii's Sermon for the Seventh Sunday after Pascha on the theme, "And This is life eternal, that they may know thee, the only true God," clarifies this point. The theme of the sermon is that of knowing God. To know God is to unite with him, a union effected through good behavior. Dymytrii, however, makes an important distinction between two kinds of good deeds.

---

[314] For a comparative analysis of Eastern and Western teachings on this subject, see the section entitled, "Faith and Good Works" in Frank Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought* (New York: AMS Press, 231–36).

There are good deeds motivated through self-interest, as demonstrated by the story of Rahab the Harlot. Rahab helps Joshua's spies to escape from Jericho and in return her house is saved from the destruction that follows. Dymytrii explains that although Rahab's assistance to Joshua's men was a good deed and she was in fact rewarded for this, it nevertheless remains a deed motivated by self-interest (i.e., Rahab acted to save her house):

> This woman eyed her private interests to ensure that her family and possessions be saved.[315]

A nobler kind of good deed is demonstrated by the sinful woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee. She anoints and washes the feet of Jesus and wipes them with her hair, for no other reason than love for God:

> This woman satisfied her heart with Divine love alone, "for she loved much" (Luke 7.47). This then is true love, not for oneself, not for one's property, but to love God only for God's sake for the satisfaction of the heart through his divine love.[316]

When Dymytrii speaks of the soul's fruitfulness through good deeds, it is this kind of good deed, done for the sake of God alone and not motivated by self-interest to which he is referring. All spiritual wisdom must be practically applied to this kind of good work, for selfless action brings human beings to the knowledge of God. Without personal acts of charity and kindness, it is impossible to know or understand God.

For Dymytrii, wisdom and good deeds must go hand in hand. The man who possesses intellectual ability but fails to perform acts of charity, is no better than the ignorant man who acts without understanding. He entitles the second chapter of his *Spiritual Alphabet*, "On how it is proper to act with reason and to obey the Lord's commandments."[317] He begins this chapter with the story of the disobedience of the first human being, Adam:

---

[315] «Бо тамъ тая усмотривала свою привату, абы фамилѣя и маетокъ былъ захованъ въ цѣлости»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 8.

[316] «а сяя абы тылко любовію божественною усладила свое сердце, яко возлюби много. То то любовь правдивая, не для себе, не для своей яковой приваты, але для самого жъ того Бога любячая Бога, для услажденія сердца любовію его божественною»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 8.

> I said that the primary reason and cause of Adam's fall was his misunderstanding. In the same way, good deeds are the beginning of understanding. For this reason rightness and the truth of understanding belong together: understanding is agreeable to truth. Without understanding, truth is an outcast. Rightness nurtures understanding and it is multiplied through mindful deeds and through obedience to God's commandments. This is why Adam was commanded to act and to obey. But instead, [Adam] did not act with understanding, nor did he obey the commandments.[318]

We see that Dymytrii presents human existence as a cycle based on good deeds and understanding. Man is created good; he then suffers from misunderstanding and commits transgression, and then he recovers his understanding and his goodness through virtuous deeds. In this respect Dymytrii presents a theology of ancestral sin that is in accordance with the teachings of the Eastern Church fathers, who emphasized that sin is an act of personal judgement and not of nature. In its response to the Augustinian teaching that implicated human nature in the sin of Adam, the Eastern Church maintained its position that sin is an act of individual will, not of human nature.[319] Dymytrii makes it clear that Adam's fall resulted from his personal behavior, not of his nature, which is shared by all human beings. Therefore, although Adam's children suffer the consequences of ancestral transgression, they do not carry the blame for it. Adam, like all human beings, enters the world sinless. But because Adam suffered from a misunderstanding, he foolishly chose to disobey God's commandment, and thus death and corruption were unnaturally introduced into the world.

---

[317] «О еже дѣлати подобаетъ разумомъ, и хранити Господня заповѣди»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 296.

[318] «Рекохомъ, яко первѣйшая вина и начало бысть Адамлю паденію безуміе, благому же дѣланію есть начинанію разумъ. Обаче же правъ и истиненъ разумъ, глаголю: разумъ бо со истиною пріятенъ есть, кромѣ же истины отверженъ есть. Правъ же разумъ возрастаетъ и умножается от дѣланія умнаго, и от храненія Божиихъ заповѣдей, якоже и въ рай Адаму заповѣдано бысть дѣлати и хранити: но понеже и дѣлаше разумомъ, того ради не сохрани заповѣданія»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 296–97.

[319] See the brief discussion of original/ancestral sin in my introduction (34–35).

Adam's fall from a state of virtue is reflected in man's moral weaknesses. If the reason that human beings sin is that they do not understand, then conversely, the path to restoring man's original state of grace and understanding is constituted by good deeds. Just as misunderstanding leads to disobedience, good behavior leads to understanding. In this respect Dymytrii echo's Loyola's assertion that children need not understand why they must follow certain lessons and exercises, because as pupils they accept such tasks in good faith. For Loyola the important thing was not that children should understand why they must perform certain exercises, but that they should obey and fulfill the tasks assigned to them. All things, from social etiquette to the most abstract theological formulas, can be inculcated into children's minds long before they are capable of understanding what these things mean and why they are necessary.

For Dymytrii, like Loyola, obedience comes first and understanding later. The reason for this is that understanding does not depend upon the human will but is a gift received from God. It is a quality that does not proceed from within the self, but is sent to the human being from heaven. For this reason it is impossible for men and women to will themselves to understanding. On the other hand, obedience depends upon personal will, and obedience to God's commandments is the path to understanding. Obedience to God's commandments is needed before Christians can receive the gifts of knowledge and understanding from the Holy Spirit.

The kind of behavior that leads to understanding is good behavior, and for such behavior truth and rightness are required. Dymytrii describes the origin of truth and rightness in a sequence of generative processes. First of all, mindful action is united with obedience to God's commandments. The union of action with obedience leads to a multiplication of rightness: "Rightness is multiplied . . . through mindful deeds and through obedience to God's commandments."[320] Rightness is therefore the offspring of the marriage between attentive works and obedience. Rightness having been generated, it is given the task of nurturing the understanding: "rightness nurtures understanding . . . through mindful deeds."[321] Rightness and understanding are companions to one another, their relationship is one of nurturing and of agreement. If there is no understanding, then truth is forsaken. Thus, the harmonious friendship of these two is fundamental to ethical living: "rightness and the truth of understanding belong together: understanding is agreeable to truth. Without understanding, truth is an outcast."

A grammarian, Dymytrii is always delighted by agreement, and he further elaborates upon this sequential union of rightness with the truth of understanding:

> That which is born of the flesh remains flesh; that which is born of the spirit remains spirit, says the Lord (John 3.6). For this reason flesh unites with flesh to give birth to flesh. In the same way, rightness and the truth of understanding are co-joined in the knowledge of all the things of God's understanding. In this manner the spirit is conceived; and after a certain period of expectation, during which one at all times endures numerous struggles, the spirit is then born. It is written, because we fear you [o Lord], we have been with child, we have been in pain and have brought forth the spirit of salvation of the Lord's grace and his divine love,

---

[320] «Правъ же разумъ . . .умножается от дѣланія умнаго, и от храненія Божиихъ заповѣдей»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 297.

[321] «Правъ же разумъ возрастаетъ . . . от дѣланія умнаго»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 2997.

> so says the prophet (Isa. 26.18). If one does not have right understanding, then one receives nothing.[322]

The sequence above is almost sexual in its description of the fruitful union of rightness with the truth of understanding. Grammatically both words are masculine; thus, the agreement is perfect. But despite the same-gender, rightness and understanding possess the generative power of a husband and wife. The two of them unite and the result is the conception of the spirit. Like an unborn child in the womb of his mother, there then follows a period of expectation. Like a woman bearing a child, struggles and pain must be endured before giving birth, but after the period of pain and struggle, the spirit is finally born.

As pastor and pedagogue, Dymytrii offers the text above for the spiritual fortification of those who read his *Alphabet*. Elsewhere—particularly in his sermons—Dymytrii repeats this idea that spiritual pain and suffering indicates that profound events are unfolding in the soul of the individual. Times of sorrow, despair and unhappiness play a pivotal role in spiritual development. In Dymytrii's re-tellings of Gospel narratives devoted to healing, he again and again emphasizes that all physical and emotional suffering has a spiritual origin. As the origins of pain are spiritual, the process of healing must deal with the spiritual processes at work in the inner chamber of the human soul. Hence the restoration of the Gadarene's spiritual calm and understanding depends upon interior illumination and self-reflection. Rather than judging or condemning those spiritually tormented, Dymytrii teaches that love and respect are the qualities needed to heal the troubled soul.

---

[322] «Рожденное от плоти, плоть есть: рожденное же от духа, духъ есть, глаголеть Господь [Апостолъ—in the 1741 edition of the *Alphabet* !]. Якоже плоть плоти сочетаяся, раждаетъ плоть: сице и правъ и истиненъ разумъ, соединяяся въ познаніи всѣхъ вещей разуму Божію, зачинаетъ начатокъ духа, и по пождательномъ времени, въ водимыхъ подвизѣхъ всегда пребываяй, раждаетъ духъ. Страха бо, рече, ради твоего во чревѣ пріяхомъ и поболѣхомъ, и родихомъ духъ спасенія Господни благодати, и Божественныя любве его, глаголетъ пророкъ. Не имѣяй же праваго разума, никогдаже сего получитъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 298. The Authorized (King James) Version reads: "We have been with child, we have been in pain, we have as it were brought forth wind." In Slavonic "dukh" may refer to both wind and spirit.

From the perspective of pastoral theology, Dymytrii's explanation of sin also demonstrates his faith in the goodness of human nature. Created by God, the natural state of the human being is one of virtue and inward harmony. For Dymytrii, sin is nothing more than a mistake caused by a misunderstanding. To illustrate, he uses the example of an archer firing at a target:

> When one does not aim right, the arrow misses the target by far. In the same way, by not thinking right, one is left standing far from God's understanding. For this reason many people wish to approach him: many struggle and many do so with zeal, but at the same time not all fire at the target with a straight and true aim. Because of this, they fall far from the target and are left standing in obscurity.[323]

It is not sufficient to have the desire to know God, nor is it sufficient to have the tools by which human beings seek God: scriptures, the writings of the fathers and so on. What is needed most of all is rightness in the way one thinks and behaves. Dymytrii points out that there are many who zealously struggle to know God and yet they fail. Faith alone is not enough. To know God, one must live according to truth and rightness.

This partnership between right thinking and right behavior is the true path to knowing God. The man who possesses knowledge but falls short on good works will never know God. Activity and good deeds are requisite, for without them all knowledge is barren:

---

[323] «Якоже стрѣляющіи неправо, далече погрѣшають цѣла, сице и неправо мудрствующіи далече отстоять разума Божія. И приближенія его мнози желають, мнози ратятся, мнози о семъ тщаніе имуть, обаче не вси равно и право въ цѣль намѣряють. Сего ради далече цѣля, отстоять въ безвѣствіи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 298.

> For this reason, anyone who wishes to have right understanding must also have mindful action at all times. Not to act according to the reasoning mind, nor to find zeal in this (as should be natural) is like the learned understanding of outward philosophers: it is of no use; it is like gold hidden in the earth, neither mined nor tempered, that is of little value. It is like a tree that is neither cared for nor pruned nor transplanted and brings forth little of the sweetness of its fruit. We see that the quantity of fruit and or emptiness [that is produced] is thus according to one's deeds.[324]

Dymytrii does not oppose the study of philosophy; on the contrary, he likens such wisdom to gold. What he is opposed to is the pursuit of philosophy in the absence of good works. Unless accompanied by charitable deeds and correct behavior, the wisdom of the philosopher possesses no value. Action is required to bring forth fruit. Without acts of charity, intellectual endeavor remains barren and fruitless. Rather than directing the learned man closer to God, philosophy ensnares him in the traps of self-importance and erudition. Elsewhere in the *Alphabet* Dymytrii cautions his readers: "Do not be trapped by self-importance and lofty thinking."[325] Like gold, wisdom must be tempered, and the elements that temper wisdom are humility, obedience and acts or charity.

At the same time, good works themselves require an attentive mind. Dymytrii's *Alphabet* advocates a path to spiritual understanding in which the human being develops the fullness of his intellect at the same time that he pursues a life of virtuous behavior. Intellect without good deeds is worthless. Likewise, to live and act without an attentive mind brings a man no closer to

---

[324] «Обаче же, хотяй кто имѣти правъ разумъ, дѣланія умнаго всегда требуетъ, не дѣлаяй бо ума разумомъ, ниже тщайся о семъ, аще и есть естественный, или от внѣшнихъ любомудрцевъ учимый разумъ, ничтоже пользуетъ: якоже злато въ земли сущее, недѣланное же и непережженное, въ малой цѣнѣ есть: или якоже древо не исчищаемо, не прицѣпляемо, не пресаждаемо, малъ же не сладокъ плодъ приноситъ. Елико же имъ кто найпаче дѣлати будетъ, толикъ плодъ и пространство узритъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 298–99.

[325] «Не буди уловляемъ самомнѣніемъ и высокомудріемъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 389.

God. For Dymytrii, the ideal state is one of intellectual fullness and mindful action:

> Mindful activity, by which we draw near to the Lord and complete our union with him, is the following: to know first all the created world, visible and comprehensible, from whom and why it was created, how it is ordered and composed, and to truly find faith in this. And in the same manner [to know] oneself and all the mysteries that are within oneself and all of his [God's] good deeds.[326]

The Purification of Reason and the Cleansing of the Understanding through Labors and Struggles

The third chapter of the *Spiritual Alphabet* entitled "On how, if a person does not act according to reason and does not purify his reason, then his reason is not right nor is it true,"[327] elaborates on the nature of the understanding and the need to purify it. The acquisition of understanding is not enough for the inward person to flourish: the understanding must be made active, pure and well-tempered:

> Understanding that is inactive and not cleansed for a long period of time is an understanding that is incomprehensible. It is an understanding that is not right and is untrue. As is the case with all outward things, there are different kinds of understanding. There is complete understanding—that of the spirit. There is intermediate understanding—that of the soul. And there is absolutely thick understanding—that of the flesh.[328]

---

[326] «Дѣланіе умное, имже имамы приближитися, и совершенно присоединитися Господеви, сіе есть: еже познати первѣе всю тварь видимую и разумѣваемую, от кого, и чесо ради сотворена бысть, и камо движима, и обращаема есть, и увѣритися о семъ истинно, таже (се)бе, и все еже о себѣ таинство, таже и вся его благодѣанія»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 299.

[327] «О еже не дѣлаяй кто разумомъ, и не очищаяй его, не правъ и не истиненъ есть разумъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 300.

[328] 328«Разумъ не дѣланъ и долгимъ временемъ не очищенъ, разумъ не разуменъ есть, не правъ и не истинень есть разумъ. Есть же разумъ различіе, якоже и всѣхъ внѣшнихъ вещей. Есть бо разумъ совершенъ, духовенъ, есть

For Dymytrii understanding (Slavonic *razum*) is an outward thing (as opposed to conscience/*sovist'*, which is an interior thing, as explained in his Sermon for the Fourth Sunday after Pascha). The intellect of man is as much an external, material and sensible entity as it is inward and reflective. The soul's understanding is an intermediate understanding: it is balanced between the flesh and the spirit. In this respect it plays the role of the charioteer—the intellect—in Plato's *Phaedrus*.[329]

If we were to outline Dymytrii's three understandings according to the *Phaedrus* paradigm, we would see that he ascribes to the understanding a three-part nature reflecting the tripartite nature of the soul:

1. The understanding of the flesh (плотскій разумъ);
2. The understanding of the soul (душевний разумъ);
3. The understanding of the spirit (духовний разумъ).

These three understandings mirror the vegetative, sensible and reasoning faculties ascribed to the soul by the neo-Platonists. Just as the master of the two horses in *Phaedrus* must hold balance and order between his animals, the reasoning man must master of the body's understanding, the soul's understanding and the spirit's understanding. In his healing discourses Dymytrii makes clear that if balance and order are not maintained among these three, the effects are catastrophic. Before all else, the sinful and the spiritually ailing person suffers from an inactive and ill-tempered understanding (i.e., an understanding that is not right and untrue). The uncleansed understanding is like a craftsman's instrument that has become twisted and malformed: not only is it of no use to him, but it may in fact cause him injury.

же посредній, душевенъ, есть же отнюдь грубъ, плотскій»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 300.

[329] Plato, *Phaedrus* in *Plato: The Collected Dialogues Including the Letters*, ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1961) 500.

To achieve inward balance and good temper, the human being must acquire complete spiritual understanding through the cleansing of his mind. But like any other learning activity, success does not always come immediately, and Dymytrii makes clear that the cleansing of the understanding requires a long period. The two elements of time and activity are required if the understanding is to be properly tempered.

A wise teacher—and an understanding pastor, Dymytrii makes allowances for human weaknesses. Occasional neglect and lack of diligence is to be expected of students:

> As is the case with any other outward learning, a person who is learning some craft may neglect his study and labor. In a similar manner when one is learning the complete spiritual understanding and the purification of the mind, one does not always do so diligently.[330]

Outward learning, according to Dymytrii, is a craft on the same level as painting, carpentry, etc. Spiritual inward wisdom is on a higher level than philosophy or any other outward artistry, deeper than either philosophy or even theology. Not all students of theology acquire inward wisdom. Nor is spiritual wisdom limited to the world of erudite scholars; it can flourish among the simplest and most unschooled people.[331] However, the important point is that similar pedagogical strategies may be employed for the acquisition of both kinds of knowledge, outward and inward. Hence, the outward strategies of humanist education can be applied to a higher purpose, that of educating the inward human being. Educating the mind and educating the soul are two different things, but common pedagogical principles can be applied to both kinds of learning:

---

[330] «Якоже убо внѣшняго ученія, или коего художества никтоже навыкнетъ, не всегда о немъ поучаяся и попеченіе творя: сице и совершеннаго духовнаго разума и очищенія умнаго кто изучится, не всегда о семъ прилѣжаніе творя»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 300.

[331] See, in chapter two, the example of Anthony, Pachomius and Paul the Simple, as given by Dymytrii.

> If one does not diligently follow the narrow path of the Gospels and if he neglects to purify his mind, then all the outward wisdom that he has acquired is but blindness to his soul: if he receives dead writings and does not accept the life-giving spirit, he will be unable to guide others or to guide himself in fullness.[332]

The idea of being filled or made complete (*sovershennii*) occurs frequently in Dymytrii's *Alphabet* and elsewhere in his writings, including his text on inward prayer, "The inner man in the chamber of his heart in solitude learns and prays in secret." The Slavonic *sovershiti* can carry several meanings, including "to complete, to perfect, to finish, to top off." Dymytrii is not talking about spiritual perfection, for the very idea of perfection is vanity. Rather it is the idea of "wholeness" or "completeness" that he intends. Those who do not allow themselves to be filled with spirit consequently suffer from lack of wholeness.

This understanding has implications for Dymytrii's approach to psychology and has been discussed above in chapter two, "*Dispositio Spiritualis.* In Dymytrii's re-telling of Gospel narratives, the healing of spiritually troubled men and women is effected through good arrangement. The rhetorician understands that if an essential element is missing from a composition, then the work will not achieve the desired effect. A pastor, Dymytrii understands that if an essential element is missing from a person's life, then that person will be unable to function. The human soul desires wholeness and completeness. This view is comparable to Plato's *Symposium*, where the individual human being is but one half of a broken unit; consequently the human being seeks to restore wholeness by finding a mate. Plato uses this model to explain the human need to find a life partner. Dymytrii offers the same dynamic, but applies it to a different kind of desire, that of the human soul seeking to unite with God. Until the human being becomes filled with the life-giving Spirit of God, his life is nothing but blindness and obscurity:

---

[332] «Не потщавыйся кто пройти собою тѣсный путь евангельскій, и о очищеніи ума вознебрегъ, аще и всю внѣшнюю мудрость извыче, слѣпъ есть душею: писма точію убивательнаго придержится, духа же оживляющаго не пріемлетъ, и не точію инѣхъ, но ниже себе совершенно исправити можетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 300.

> The understanding of this world is one thing, the understanding of the spirit is another. Spiritual understanding was taught to the saints by the Most Holy Spirit. Today, understanding is taught not by the Holy Spirit, but from Aristotle, Cicero, Plato and the other pagan philosophers, and for this reason [this kind of understanding] remains completely blinded by lies and deceives [men] from the true path of understanding. The saints learned the commandments of Christ and [they acquired] mindful action. Those other men learned only according to the words that they uttered: the interior of their souls is darkness and obscurity, their entire wisdom is but on their tongues (Matt. 15.8).[333]

Here we see Dymytrii's approach to Christian humanism. Along with Erasmus and the humanists, he understands ancient wisdom within the context of the Christian revelation. The ancient philosophers and rhetoricians were pagans who lived in the darkness that preceded the light of Christ's Gospel. Their wisdom was the exterior wisdom of the world, not the interior wisdom of the spirit. The eloquence of the pagan's speech concealed the blindness of their souls. As Erasmus explained:

> What can Christ have in common with Aristotle? What have these quibbling sophistries to do with the mysteries of eternal wisdom? What is the purpose of these labyrinthine *quaestiones*, of which so many are pointless, so many really harmful, if for no other reason, as a source of strife and contention. . . . If laws must be laid down, let it be done reverently and not in arrogance and in accordance

---

[333] «Инъ бо есть разумъ міра сего, инъ же есть духовенъ: духовнаго бо разума от Пресвятаго Духа учишася вси святіи, и просвѣтишася яко солнце въ мірѣ. Днесь же не от Духа Свята, но от Арістотеля, Ціцерона, Платона, и прочихъ языческихъ любомудрцевъ разума учатся. Сего ради до конца ослѣпоша лжею, и прельстишася от пути праваго въ разумѣ. Святіи заповѣдей Хрістовыхъ, и умнаго дѣланія учишася, сіи же точію словесъ изглаголаніи учатся: внутрь души мракъ и тма, на языцѣ же вся ихъ премудрость»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 300–301.

> with the scriptures, not with the so-called reasoning thought up by ordinary men.[334]

Dymytrii gives a similar warning to all students of rhetoric and philosophy. For a man to have true wisdom, he must not look to the ancient philosophers, but to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Obedience to God's commandments teaches a man wisdom. Eloquence and mental acumen may be acquired from studying the ancients, but true wisdom comes from the Holy Spirit alone. Philosophy and rhetoric are but blindness and deception, if untempered with Christian love and obedience.

Dymytrii points out that a learned intellect devoid of the Spirit's fullness is in reality a mindless and obscure thing. The erudite man who has not been enlightened by the Holy Spirit suffers from intellectual paralysis, his mind truly inactive like bread made without salt. Without the grace of the Holy Spirit the intellect sinks into mindlessness, ill temper and sinful thoughts and deeds:

> Every inactive mind, unenlightened and unsalted by the salt of the grace of the Most Holy Spirit, becomes mindless and stinks with numerous passionate deeds and thoughts.[335]

Dymytrii's warning on eloquence and erudition is as old as the art of rhetoric itself. During the classical era and well into the Early Modern period, Aristotle's Rhetoric was taught in tandem with his Ethics.[336] Dymytrii, like Aristotle, is aware that eloquence can easily be misappropriated for evil purposes. In this respect his admonition to students to beware of the ancients is doubly urgent, for rhetoric does not lead astray the scholar alone Once he has fallen into lies and deception, the learned man can lead others into darkness and obscurity.

---

[334] Quoted in Léon-E. Halkin 99.

[335] «Всякъ умъ не дѣлань, не просвѣщенъ, не осоленъ бывши солію благодати Пресвятаго Духа, обезумится, и различными страстными дѣянми и помышленми возсмердится»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 302.

[336] Again, see Stephen Halliwell's "The Challenge of Rhetoric to Political and Ethical Theory in Aristotle" 175–205.

Through his eloquence he deceives other men from the path of true understanding.

It is for this reason that all learned men must apply themselves to the education of the spirit. Dymytrii tells his readers that erudition without spiritual understanding is nothing but mindless labor:

> He who acquires outward wisdom but neglects that of the spirit, is like a man with one eye, or a man who stands on one leg. The outward wisdom of this world is a bodily labor that is without mindful activity: it is like paps that are dry, or a tree that is barren, it is said. For this reason the saints did not stand on only one [leg] of labor and learning, that of the exterior. Instead, they applied themselves to learning that of the interior, that is, the purification of the mind. If they only had studied outward learning and not that of the Spirit, they would not have been saints, nor would the grace of the Most Holy Spirit have dwelled in their souls.[337]

Dymytrii's image of the one-legged erudite who lacks spiritual understanding is not in any way intended to derogate scholarship. On the contrary, a man's outward education, be it formal or informal, is one of the legs upon which he stands. But to hold himself up properly—indeed to balance himself—a man requires the second leg of spiritual understanding. Only by standing upon both these legs, of outward and inward wisdom, can the human being temper his mind and enlighten his soul. Unless a man acquires inward wisdom, all the wisdom of the world will be of no benefit to his soul:

---

[337] «Навыкнувый кто внѣшнія мудрости, духовную же вознебрегъ, подобенъ есть о единомъ очѣ, или о единой нозѣ сущему. Внѣшняя міра сего мудрость и тѣлесный трудъ, кромѣ умнаго дѣланія, яко сосцы сухи, яко древо неплодовито, глаголетъ нѣкто, того ради не преставаху святіи не единомъ внѣшнемъ точію трудъ и ученіи, потщашася навыкнути и внутренняго, сирѣчь очищенія умнаго. Аще бы во внѣшнѣмъ ученіи точію были училися, въ духовномъ же ни, не были бы святіи, ниже благодатъ Пресвятаго Духа пребывала бы въ душахъ ихъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 301–2.

> If one masters all the wisdom of this world but does not purify his mind nor enlighten his soul, then it is impossible for him to unite with God.[338]

The purpose of a Christian life is to become a dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit. For this reason Dymytrii exhorts his readers to follow the example of the saints. By applying themselves to the pursuit of inward wisdom and by tempering their intellects with spiritual understanding, they may become vessels of Divine Grace:

> A man's understanding is naturally bestowed from God. For this reason, if a man does not activate [his understanding], it becomes dark and obscure. Activity brightens it and brings it to complete enlightenment.[339]

It is possible to live without book learning and still receive spiritual wisdom. The first leg that a man stands on is his outward wisdom and illiterate men and women acquire knowledge in the things of this world. The most important thing is to live virtuously and in accordance with God's commandments, and to accomplish this a formal education is not necessary. The second leg, however, that of inward wisdom, is needed by all people. Dymytrii does not disdain scholarly pursuits; rather, he puts them in their proper place. It is possible to live a virtuous life without erudition, but it is impossible to live virtuously without inward understanding. Prayer and obedience carry a higher value than rhetoric and philosophy. The important thing is to spiritually educate one's understanding, a kind of wisdom greater than Aristotle, Plato and Cicero.

---

[338] «Аще кто и всю мудрость міра сего извыкнетъ, не очиститъ же ума, ниже просвѣтится душею, Богу соединитися не возможетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 302.

[339] «Разумъ бо комуждо естественно от Господа всажденъ есть, обаче не дѣлаяй кто имъ, помрачается и потемнѣваетъ: дѣлаяй же уясняется, и въ совершенное просвѣщеніе приходитъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 302.

This idea, of course, is deeply rooted in Christian thought, particularly St. Paul's injunction:

> Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, he taketh the wise in their own craftiness. And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain (I Cor. 3.18–20)

Dymytrii is one of a long line of Christian thinkers who approach academic study with caution in accordance with St. Paul's injunction, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ" (Col. 2.8). Leaders in the field of education during the Early Modern period, including Comenius and Loyola, disliked and distrusted contemporary universities: in his *Constitutions* Loyola even expressed scorn for his own graduate studies at the University of Paris. Like Comenius and Loyola, Dymytrii does not base his distrust of the academy on a dislike of intellectual life, but on the belief that academic knowledge is artificial, not true knowledge. Like all other tasks, knowledge of the world must be put to use for a higher purpose, that is to serve God. If education is not directed to this end, then it is a vain task, according to Ecclesiastes: "The work that is wrought under the sun is grievous unto me: for all is vanity and vexation of spirit" (Eccles. 2.17).

Elocution and the Resolution of Conflict: Rachel's Lament

Spiritual elocution depends upon spiritual wellness, for the human being's inward state governs his ability to perform good works. Throughout his *Alphabet* Dymytrii makes clear that sin is a kind of sickness: it is not natural to the human spirit and does not belong in the well-ordered microcosmos of the soul. It is disorder, an inability to exercise good judgement. Healing the troubled soul forms an integral part of spiritual elocution: the disorder and chaos of sin must be dispelled first to ensure that human beings choose to perform good deeds.

Dymytrii's *Drama on the Nativity of Christ* illustrates this belief. Scene Ten of the drama consists of a monologue by a dramatic character named Rachel's Lament. Following King Herod's orders to slay all the infant males in Bethlehem, the character of Rachel's Lament appears on stage to comment on this tragic event.

Dymytrii consciously plays with a rhetorical concept here. Rachel's Lament is the name of the dramatic character. The character is an act of speech—a lament—and what she does on stage is to talk about the act of communication. Paradoxically, she speaks to inform us that her tongue cannot speak, for she is overcome with grief. But her reason will not allow her to remain silent. Her understanding will force her tongue to speak and sound her lament so that others may hear.

Rachel's Lament recites her soliloquy in a series of couplets made up of one thirteen-syllable line and a second eleven-syllable line. In her very first couplet she presents the fundamental problem of communication and the will's reluctance:

> Shall I force my tongue to speak, or utter no reply
> When I hear you question me, from where and who am I?[340]

First we observe a conflict of will between the will of the body and that of the soul. The tongue, by its nature, is something that must be forced into an appropriate response—either speech or silence. Both alternatives are valid choices. However, a decision must be made between the two—judgement must be exercised. Hence, this couplet presents a question of reasonable choice. Secondly, it also presents this communicative dilemma as a question of identity. For this character's identity to be determined, a question must be posed ("from where and who am I?") and a response either given or not given. If Rachel's Lament chooses the option of silence rather than speech, then her identity will not *materialize*—she will remain in obscurity. Materialize is the operative word here, for the expression of identity requires a sensible form. The tongue must produce audible words, or the hand must produce written characters on paper, or some other kind of sensible response must be produced in order to reveal an identity. A disembodied identity cannot exist, for identity depends upon sensibility. It follows then that silence is the equivalent of failing to give form to identity. To Renaissance grammarians and rhetoricians, failure to articulate is a kind of betrayal of oneself, or failing to give substance to one's identity.

---

[340] This translation of "Rachel's Lament" is by Mary Ann Szporluk, and has been published in: Mary Ann Szporluk and I. R. Titunik, "Ukrainian Baroque Drama in Translation," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 24 (1988):12–16. As this is Szporluk's own published translation, I will not supply the original Slavonic in my footnote text. The original Slavonic can be found in Rezanov 4:128–32.

This silence of non-speaking/non-identity is related to the silence of death. In the *Spiritual Alphabet* Dymytrii says:

> He who has learned understanding and all the knowledge of all things . . . will receive the resurrection of the soul, and before life [eternal] he will inherit eternal life. The silence of death is consumed in the understanding and knowledge of life. For it is said, this is life eternal, to know the Lord; and this is death, to understand him not.[341]

Thus, death is silent: it neither speaks nor does it understand. Therefore, life entails eloquence and understanding. Rachel's Lament's inability to articulate reveals that she is in a precarious state of spiritual crisis, one in which she languishes in a state of non-identity and obscurity.

---

[341] «. . . и научивыйся кто разуму, и всѣхъ вещей познанію . . . . Сицевый прежде воскресенія, воскресеніе души пріемлетъ, и прежде жизни, жизнь вѣчную наслѣдуетъ, во еже пожертой быти безсловесія смерти, разума и познанія жизнію: се бо, рече, есть животъ вѣчный, да познаемъ Господа, се же и смерть, не разумѣти о немъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 296.

Rachel's Lament is a character presented with two difficult choices: she may either remain silent, thereby depriving herself of life, or she may speak and thereby take on the risks that accompany the act of articulating. Clearly, Dymytrii, the author, has already indicated which of the two possibilities the audience desires—to hear her speak and identify herself. But this desire does not exclude a seventeenth-century audience's awareness of the danger that accompanies the act of speaking. The dramatic tension at the beginning of this scene relies on an awareness of the creative and destructive forces that are unleashed when one speaks and articulates one's identity.

The second couplet of Rachel's Lament presents a Renaissance understanding of the character's communicative disorder. The impairment of speech is a consequence of emotional turmoil:

> Lamentation hinders me from speaking forth my tale;
> Often sobs well up in me and cause my words to fail.[342]

This character is in a state of emotional distress, whose cause is not yet identified, but whose consequences are revealed. Sorrow hinders speech from occurring. Grief causes language to fail. The connection between soul and language is exemplified here. The soul's response to sorrow is sensible: sobs, which consist of visible tears and mournful sounds. The soul itself is sensible, and emotion is one of the soul's sensibilities. Renaissance thinkers viewed emotion as a something belonging to the sensible realm. Sorrow and grief, like all emotions, are sensations that are felt physically in the human flesh. Sorrow is sensible—it consists of moist tears, painful cries, physical gestures. This approach to psychology contrasts sharply with the later, modern view of human emotions as inner workings of the mind. During the Renaissance, the inner workings of the mind were reason and understanding. Emotion, on the other hand, was a sensible, irrational thing. It was rooted in the body's response to external stimuli, i.e., Rachel sees with her spiritual eyes the bodies of dead children; and wet tears flow from her eyes and mournful sobs emit from her breast.

---

[342] Szporluk 12.

Rachel's Lament presents us with a moment of sorrow, and we behold the response of the sensible soul to grief. As a consequence of the soul's sensible response of sorrow, language fails to find sensible articulation. Words must be spoken—they must be given a sensible form. But in a state of distress either choking silence or inarticulate sobs replace the sounds of intelligible language. Thus, the failure of language is a consequence of spiritual malaise or weakness of the soul. It represents a universal dynamic in which formlessness exists as the primordial stuff from which reason and understanding must create. Compare this to the Genesis creation narrative, where God creates out of formlessness, nothingness and darkness.

The third couplet of Rachel's Lament supplies a dramatic turning point—the decision to articulate and the desire to create meaningful utterance:

> Yet I cannot be silent; my heart is seized with pain
> And my soul full wounded is, great grief it does sustain.[343]

The will overcomes the body's reluctance to speak. The body—the flesh of the heart—is seized with pain. To the Renaissance physiologist the human heart was the fleshly center of the human being's emotional life. This was obvious, for in moments of joy the heart races; in moments of despair it becomes heavy and falls. During the seventeenth century emotion was understood as a kind of physical movement: during fear man's viscera tremble; during anger his blood runs quickly and becomes hot.

---

[343] Szporluk 12.

These ideas are at the core of Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melacholy* (1621). As H. James Jenson explains:

> The good affection is joy, which dilates the heart and preserves the body. The bad affections are simple and mixed. The simple are emotions like sorrow and fear. Sorrow, for example, constricts the heart, macerates the soul, causes melancholy and even death. The mixed affections are such passions as anger, revenge, hatred (inveterate anger), zeal (against one who hurts what you have loved), joy at another's bad luck, pride, self-love and envy. They are mixed because a little of each is necessary for health and stability. They are bad when they overcome the reason and are used for bad purposes.[344]

The body of the character identified as Rachel's Lament sees the slaughter of the Bethlehem children. The sensibilities of Rachel's soul being affected, her heart reacts with pain. Hence, the sensation of emotion corresponds to the *movere* of Cicero's stylistic triad of *docere, movere,* and *delectare*. The act of moving, whether it be the heart that is moved by emotion, or the audience that is moved by eloquence, depends upon the interaction between the body's senses and the soul's sensibilities.

To Dymytrii's audience the connection between Rachel's flesh and her emotions would have been immediately sensed. For seventeenth-century men and women emotions were physical, sensible realities, having their origins in the soul's sensibilities. But they are also determined by the soul's reason: Rachel's Lament has to understand what it is that she has seen before her eyes in Bethlehem. Of course Dymytrii is referring to the prophetic eyes of Rachel, not her living eyes, for in her lifetime none of her own children were slain. But prophetic eyes are better, because prophecy is a special gift from God. The heartache that accompanies Rachel's prophetic gaze is not a modern metaphor for a psychological state, it is the seventeenth-century's understanding of a real physiological and spiritual pain that is felt in Rachel's heart.

---

[344] H. James Jensen 87.

Rachel's heart "is seized with pain" and her soul "full wounded is." The soul's sensibility is here exemplified by the physical ache of the heart that goes hand in hand with the wounding of her soul. The order of this sentence is interesting and says much about the dynamic involving speech, sensibility and the soul. If we were to break up the sentence, retaining Dymytrii's order, we would see the following sequence:

1. I cannot be silent;
2. my heart is seized with pain ;
3. and my soul full wounded is, great grief it does sustain.

In other words:

1. Resolution to speak;
2. physiological sensation;
3. accompanied by the soul's sensible response to the presence of grief.

Unlike the second couplet, which presents inability to speak in the presence of sorrow alone, the third couplet presents a third element: the soul and its sensibility. Unlike the second, in which speech is hindered, the third couplet gives a resolution to speak. Thus, it is suggested that the will to articulate proceeds from the soul. The wounded body in couplet two falls into dumbness and inarticulateness; by contrast, the wounded soul in couplet three drives Rachel's Lament to speak.

Dymytrii's belief that the decision whether to articulate or not depends upon the psychological and spiritual state of the heart is confirmed in the fourth couplet. In this couplet, Rachel's Lament presents arguments in favor of articulating:

> How can a fire be hidden that rages in the breast?
> How can I conceal the pain of spirit so distressed?[345]

These rhetorical questions proceed from the soul's reason. A raging fire cannot be hidden, nor can distress and pain be concealed. The fire that is felt in Rachel's breast—in her heart—and the pain that distresses the spirit do not tolerate muteness. Again, it is the spirit or the soul that moves the will to articulate. Sorrow can hinder speech (as in couplet two), but the soul, with its will to speak, transcends the tongue's inclination to silence.

In the fifth couplet, we indeed hear a voice cry out—the voice of the spirit of Rachel's Lament:

> From out of my soul's affliction, my spirit's voice proclaims
> The great grief alive within it and "Woe, o Woe!" exclaims.[346]

The relationship between the soul and the spirit here is noteworthy. The spirit, driven by the soul's affliction, is moved to exclaim, "Woe, o Woe!" This couplet raises the question of soul and spirit and the meaning of these two words. Doubtless, Dymytrii's understanding of soul and spirit would have been primarily based on St. Paul's distinction between these two, explained in the Epistles to the Hebrews and to the Thessalonians. In Hebrews, Paul writes that "the word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4.12). In 1 Thessalonians, Paul writes, "Your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess. 5.23). A number of Church Fathers, drawing from St. Paul, made a distinction between spirit and soul, among them Justin Martyr, Tatian, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa and Ephrem the Syrian.[347] In the passage to the Hebrews, the spirit was understood by the Fathers not as a substance separate and independent from the soul (Apollinarius taught that the human being had three natures: body, soul and spirit) but as the inward and most hidden side of the soul. The passage from 1 Thessalonians was interpreted to mean that the spirit represented a higher harmony of the hidden part of the soul, formed through the grace of the Holy Spirit in a Christian. What Dymytrii is referring to in Rachel's Lament is most likely in accordance with St. Paul's passage to the Hebrews: i.e., that the spirit represents a higher life of the human soul. Neo-Platonists called it the rational soul, thereby harmonizing Plato's *Phaedrus* with St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews.

---

[345] Szporluk 12.
[346] Szporluk 12.

The fifth couplet of Rachel's lament tells us that it is the spirit—the rational part of the soul—that governs language. In this respect, Dymytrii's notion of spirit fits squarely with the neo-Platonic idea of the rational soul. To the Florentine humanists, it was the rational soul that governed language; for Dymytrii, it is the rational part of the soul as it is described by St. Paul—the spirit—that performs this same function.

The sixth and seventh couplets complete the communicative act. The voice announces her identity, and the audience's desire to know what they behold with their eyes, is addressed:

> Thus do I announce to all who fix their gaze on me,
> Desiring to be apprised of what this is they see:
> I am Rachel's mournful wail, I am her sad lament,
> And truly many sorrows to Rachel's heart were sent.[348]

---

[347] Michael Pomazansky, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology: A Concise Exposition*, trans. Seraphim Rose (Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1984) 135.
[348] Szporluk 12.

Thus we see Rachel's Lament as a complex sequence involving speaker and audience and within each participant a series of sequences involving body and soul and within the soul, the interaction between the sensible and the rational.

As Rachel's Lament elaborates upon the Gospel text that is the source of her identity, she underlines the incongruity of the Gospel passage with the book of Genesis, where no mention is made of Rachel's children being slain. Matthew's text is a paraphrasing of Jer. 31.15; Dymytrii's paraphrasing of the Matthew text (and indirectly of the Jeremiah passage from which Matthew's was derived) may be compared with scriptures:

> Jeremiah's text:
>
> Thus saith the Lord; A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children because they were not. (Jer. 31.15)
>
> Matthew's text:
>
> In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and would not be comforted, because they are not. (Matt. 2.18)
>
> Finally, Dymytrii's version:
>
> A voice was heard in Ramah, loud tears did Rachel shed
> For her beloved children, children dearly perished,
> Who at the hands of evil, pitiless men perished.
> Thenceforth Rachel would refuse to be consoled again,
> Having seen the dreadful sight of all her children slain.[349]

We observe the added sensibilities of Dymytrii's Rachel in this passage. Her tears are loud, the sight she sees dreadful. The tears of Jeremiah's Rahel are bitter, while those of Dymytrii's are loud—a truly Baroque juxtaposition of sensiblities . Dymytrii adds the information that Rachel's children met their end at the hands of evil, pitiless men. This detail serves to explain why Rachel's grief is inconsolable, for her children were slain in a most dreadful manner.

---

[349] Szporluk 12.

But here Dymytrii throws a twist into Rachel's monologue. The voice of Rachel's Lament gives sound to another voice, who objects to her story:

> But may not someone gainsay: "Few fruits did Rachel bear;
> for long her womb was barren, then two sons did appear:
> Joseph, a youth most handsome and Benjamin her last;
> After Rachel bore these two, her time on earth had passed.[350]

The voice points out the incongruity of Rachel's Lament with the circumstances of her life, as known from scriptures (Gen. 29–35). How could Rachel mourn for the death of her sons, when these offspring outlived her? The critical voice reiterates this apparent contradiction and demands an explanation:

> Yet her sons lived a long while; here children both were sound,
> They multiplied their people and both great tribes did found:
> Over whom, then, I wonder, grieves this mother forlorn?
> Over whom does she sorrow? What infant does she mourn?[351]

Here we see exemplified the conflict of the sensible world and in particular the conflict inherent in the sensibility of language. We hear one thing from Rachel's Lament—that she is weeping for her children. We hear another thing from the unidentified voice that contradicts her. Jeremiah and Matthew support the first statement., the book of Genesis supports the second. Hence we have incongruity between what our eyes have seen read in the books of Jeremiah and Matthew and what our ears have heard Rachel's Lament say to us.

At this point Dymytrii adds an element to his version of the Genesis narrative, one that allows us to figure our way out of the textual labyrinth. He explains that, with the birth of Joseph, Rachel received the spirit of a prophet and foresaw the sufferings of Joseph, of the descendents of her second son Benjamin. Having seen the vision of Joseph sold into slavery, of the Benjaminites, many of them slain by the Assyrians and the remainder taken into captivity in Babylon, the prophetic Rachel wept bitterly.

---

[350] Szporluk 12.
[351] Szporluk 12.

But Dymytrii adds that "for none of these children did Rachel lament more" than for the innocents slain in Bethlehem by King Herod. Dymytrii's imagination invents a voice for Rachel crying from her tomb in Bethlehem, and here for a second time he retells and elaborates upon Matthew's Gospel text:

> Just as the evangelist wrote down for men to see:
> "A voice is heard in Ramah; most woeful come its moans
> From the town of Bethlehem, whose dirge it now intones.
> Rachel's weeping voice is heard and with more pain it sounds
> Than did her first lament, in grief it so abounds.
> For then the cry of mourning from one lone throat was born,
> And from a single pair of eyes tears issued forth forlorn;
> But now for every infant, for each whose blood is shed,
> A mother's voice is howling in mourning for her dead."[352]

Note the interplay between imagination and reason in Dymytrii's version of this story. Reason dictates that because Rachel died giving birth to her second born Benjamin and was therefore outlived by her children, she could not then be weeping for her children in her own lifetime. The imagination offers two possibilities: either Rachel weeps in her own lifetime over the future sufferings of Joseph and of Benjamin's descendents, or she weeps from her grave over the slaughter of the children of Bethlehem. Both are reasonable, and they complement each other.

Thus, reason initially points out the impossibility presented by the Biblical texts. Then the imagination steps in and suggests possible alternatives. Finally, the understanding makes a judgement, based on the information received from the eyes, the ears and the imagination. For the imagination is sensible. We can imagine that Rachel has the gift of prophecy because we have seen and heard elsewhere in scripture that such things occur: with our own eyes we can read the story of Joseph and see it written that Rachel's son was himself a prophet.

---

[352] Szporluk 12.

Rachel's Lament demonstrates the symbiotic relationship between the sensible body and the reasonable soul. This dramatic character overcomes her tongue's reluctance to speak by force of will, thereby forcing the soul's governance upon the reluctant body. This character butresses the *Spiritual Alphabet*'s rhetorical principle that the soul's arrangement—its disposition—is intimately connected to the act of spiritual elocution. A harmonious relationship between sensibility and reason must be maintained; otherwise the act of communication itself will be hindered and impaired. For Dymytrii, physical and spiritual wellness is tied to language and its ability to move the soul and to discipline the body through appropriate action. In this manner, the soul's elocution through good works depends upon a harmonious accord between the soul's will, its understanding and its sensibility. The spiritual rhetorician must occupy himself in the soul's task of *elocutio* by bringing forth good works and virtuous living, for interior knowledge without deeds is empty and barren. Like eloquence, inward knowledge must be given the force of expression, for it is acts of love and kindness that fortify the Christian with the power of *elocutio spiritualis*.

Chapter Four: *Memoria Spiritualis*

The fourth component of Classical rhetoric, known as *memoria,* has its spiritual counterpart presented in the last chapters of Dymytrii's *Alphabet.* *Memoria* is the art of mindfulness, and just as the rhetorician must learn to improvise on the basis of memory, so too must the soul learn to correctly perceive the world around it and to act accordingly by means of its spiritual mindfulness. The role that the five senses play in the process of spiritual *memoria* is central, for they are the windows by which the soul perceives the world around it; the impressions that the senses communicate to the soul's understanding form the basis of its *memoria.* At all times Christians must be mindful of God's presence, since it is through such mindfulness that they are able to navigate the spiritual dangers surrounding them.

The *Alphabet* ends with a collection of five poems, corresponding to the five senses of the human body. Dymytrii instructs his reader that these poems are to be read sensibly, that is, he must engage his five senses together as he proceeds through these texts. Here Dymytrii is referring to the five senses in their neo-Platonic understanding whereby they function as windows or portals to man's interior world. Man's eyes, ears, nose, tongue and his sense of touch enable him to advance through all visible and comprehensible things, thereby opening up the higher part of his understanding. His higher understanding being opened up, he then immerses himself in inner knowledge and mystery. In his mindfulness of the ineffable and unknowable presence of God, he unites with him in love. Hence the five senses are the secret passages to the interior memory of the soul, and it is though the soul's sensibilities that the human being enters into a state of constant mindfulness of Divine presence, love and mystery.

Dymytrii explains it thus:

> At this point conclude the 33 chapters. For it is this many years that the Lord lived in the flesh, and the preceding chapters were arranged in the same number so that the reader will endeavor to put aside child-like thinking and instead come forward and acquire the complete understanding of a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. The chapters that follow at the end are arranged in the number of "five" for such are the five senses of the human being's head; the reason for this is that a person should read these every day with his five senses together and at all times directing himself to God. By advancing through all visible and understandable things, the higher part of his mind will be opened up. For it is in this deeper, inner understanding and mystical knowledge that a person must immerse himself, and it is with the unspeakable and unknowable invisible mystery that he must be united as one and with his heart and mind, at all times without ceasing, sing these warm poems, saying, "I will love you, O Lord, my strength" (Ps. 18.1) and so on.[354]

The Psalm verse "I will love you, O Lord, my strength," begins the first of the five poems that follow.

It would be tempting to propose a one-to-one correspondence between each of the five senses and the five poems that follow. However, Dymytrii's instruction, "that a person should read these every day with his five senses together and at all times directing himself to God," suggests that a one-to-one correspondence is not necessarily intended. The five senses are clearly to work together at all times, for to follow the sensibility of one of the five senses, without heeding the other four, may lead the human being into error and confusion. A Christian neo-Platonist, Dymytrii is aware that the five senses often relate conflicting messages to the mind, and it is the task of man's reason and understanding to exercise judgement and determine what is correct.

---

[354] «До здѣ тридесятимъ и тріемъ главамъ скончаніе. Во елика лѣта по плоти бысть Господь, въ толикая числа и предидущыя главы составлены суть, да прочитаяй кто потщитися, оставль младенческая мудрованія, прійти и достигнути въ мужа совершенна, въ мѣру возраста исполненія Хрістова. Сія же послѣдующыя пятичувственныя главы особы внѣ числа въ концѣ положены, того ради, да на всякъ день прочитаяй кто пяточисленная сугубая чувства, къ Богу всегда возводитъ, и вся видимая и разумѣваемая превозшедъ выспрь умомъ воскрилився, бо внутреннюю же глубину разума и познанія таинственаго погруженъ бывъ ктому неизреченнѣ и недовѣдомѣ невидимому въ тайнѣмъ соединеніи соединенъ сый, безпрестани, сердцемъ и умомъ, всегда сія стіхословія теплѣ возопіетъ глаголя: возлюблю тя Господи крѣпосте моя, и прочая»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 433.

Thus, when reading the five poems, the essential concern is not which of the five senses correspond to a given poem, but the interaction of the five sensibilities working together, the manner in which these perceptions are related to the soul and how understanding and reason direct the human being along the path of goodness in the midst of sensible confusion. According to its nature, confusion is indeed *sensible,* for it is in a confusing state that human beings perceive the world around them and the mind must sort out the conflicting messages relayed by the senses.

The idea that the five senses serve as the soul's windows was well-developed during the Classical period.[355] Cicero believed that it is not with eyes and ears that men see or hear, but with the soul. It is the soul that sees and hears, while the eyes and ears function as windows though which the soul perceives the world around it. Cicero saw the five senses as a kind of citadel, the highest point being occupied by the eyes. The most important of the soul's three parts, that is, the soul's reason, likewise dwelled in the highest part of the citadel, the head. The Platonic thinking behind Cicero's imagery is obvious, Cicero himself acknowledging Plato's *Timaeus* as his source.[356]

The question of the five senses and their role in spiritual perception was further developed under the influence of Christianity. The Church Fathers pursued this idea in connection with the Gospel injunction, "The eye of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, they whole body shall be full of light.

---

[355] Vinge 31–39.
[356] Cited in Vinge 33. See Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 1: 20

But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness" (Matt. 6.22–23). Of all the Church Fathers, St. Augustine exerted the greatest influence on the Christian understanding of the five senses and their role in spiritual perception.[357] Augustine believed that the senses play a fundamental role in acquisition of knowledge, because the knowledge of God is attained through the perception of the material world. Again, the neo-Platonic influence is undeniable, and it may have entered Augustine's thought via Cicero and other interpretors of Plato.[358] In his *Confessions* Augustine uses the five senses not only as a rhetorical device around which to structure his writing, but also to describe the phenomenon of sensation as a whole and its relation to the interior world of the soul.

The association of the five senses with *memoria* dates back to the classical period. Quintillian considered *memoria* the treasure house of oratory, for "our whole education depends on memory and we shall receive instruction all in vain if all we hear slips from us, while it is the power of memory alone that brings before us all the store of precedents, laws, rulings, sayings and facts which the orator must possess in abundance and which he must always hold ready for immediate use."[359] Cicero considered the memory a mnemotechnical system based on visual images and dependent upon the sense of sight for retention:

> It has been sagaciously discerned by Simonides or else discovered by some other person, that the most complete pictures are formed in our minds of the things that have been conveyed to them and imprinted on them by the senses, but that the keenest of

---

[357] Vinge 39–46.

[358] George Howie examines the Platonic foundations of Augustine's educational theory in his monograph *Educational Theory and Practice in Augustine* (London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1969). See especially chapter four, "Intellect and the Quest for Truth" (99–138).

[359] Quintillian, *Institutio oratoria* 11.2.1 (3: 213).

> all our senses is the sense of sight and that consequently perceptions received by the ears, or by reflection, can be most easily retained in the mind if they are also conveyed to our minds by the mediation of the eyes, with the result that things not seen and not lying in the field of visual discernment are earmarked by a sort of outline and shape that we keep hold of as it were by an act of sight things that we can scarcely embrace by an act of thought.[360]

On the question of how the soul comes to understand God, Augustine associated the five senses with man's ability to store conceptions of all that he has experienced of the world. All conceptions enter the human being through his five senses; they are then retained in the memory and are be brought forward at a later date provided, of course, they have not been forgotten. This inward library of conceptions comprises everything that the human being has been and perceived, and serves as the basic material with which he moves toward his understanding of God. The organization of man's memory is therefore fundamentally based upon his five senses. Augustine explained that in the rooms of memory everything is arranged in five categories corresponding to the five senses that function as the sensible world's doorways to the inward person.[361] Memory is the process of recalling one's sense-impressions, and it is not images but sensibility itself that is stored in the memory and recalled. Thus sense impressions may be perceived directly through the five senses, or they may be stored in the memory and recalled without requiring the senses to perform their initial receptive function. As Augustine explained:

> For I have run through all the doors of my flesh and I do not find through which of them they entered. For my eyes say: "if they are coloured, we announced them"; my ears say: "if they sounded, we have disclosed them"; the nose says: "if they smelt, they passed in by me"; even the sense of taste says: "if it is not a taste, do not ask

---

[360] Cicero, *De Oratore* 2.87.355 (1: 467).
[361] Quoted in Vinge 41. See Augustine, *Confessions* 10: 8.

> me"; touch says: "if it is not a body, I did not handle it and if I did not handle it, I did not disclose it."[362]

Like Augustine's *Confessions*, Dymytrii's *Alphabet* uses the five fields of perception not simply as a rhetorical device, but to communicate the deeper concept of man's spiritual perception as a whole. Like Augustine, Dymytrii believes that man's power of understanding God depends upon his five senses. Dymytrii's conviction that advancement through the visible and understandable world of the senses permits the higher part of the mind to be opened up does indeed suggest common ground with the ideas of Cicero and Augustine, either from original sources or through later commentaries.[363]

The numerical significance of the number "five" in Dymytrii's Five-Sense Poems becomes even more complex—and more clear—when one examines the five-fold numerical symbolism reflected in Dymytrii's own devotional life. Dymytrii taught his students to say the Lord's Prayer five times in commemoration of the the five wounds of Jesus.[364] He also arranged his devotional poem "A Divine Meditation on the Most Holy Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ" (Богомысленное размышленіе о пресвятыхъ страстехъ Господа нашего Іисуса Христа) on the basis of a five-fold structure similar to a Roman Catholic rosary.[365] In Dymytrii's Passion works, the five wounds of Jesus are the doors by which the Christian enters into physical and spiritual communion with

---

[362] Dymytrii was well acquainted with Augustine's life and work and cited him in his sermons, including the Sermon on the Dormition (Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 66) and the Sermon on the Nativity of Christ (Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Propovedi* 89). Dymytrii also included Augustine in the 1689 edition of his *Reading Menaea* , despite the fact that the Orthodox Church has never conferred sainthood upon this Latin Church Father. Dymytrii was censured for this by Patriarch Ioakim of Moscow. See Shliapkin, 238ff.

[363] Quoted in Vinge 42. See Augustine, *Confessions* 10: 10.

[364] N. Makkaveiskii, "Sviatyi Dimitrii, mitropolit Rostovski, kak pastyr i pastrolog," *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii* (1910) 1: 47.

[365] On a rosary there are five groups of ten beads and each group is separated by a single bead. Whereas a rosary consists of five groups of "Hail Mary's", Dymytrii's poem is structured according to five groups of "Our Father's." For the text of the above-mentioned poem see: Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 139–48.

God's Son.[366] The common idea at work in Dymytrii's five-fold symbolism is that of five entry points to the interior person: the eyes, ears, nose, mouth and tongue (representing the two related senses of taste and touch) are portals to the soul, just as Jesus' five wounds are portals by which the Christian enters into him and becomes one with him. When Dymytrii speaks of the five senses, he is bestowing upon them a personification as windows or doors to the soul that originated in Classical philosophy.[367] For Dymytrii, as for other neo-Platonic humanists, the senses are portals to the interior world of the human soul. Like any other doors, they may permit both desirable and undesirable occupants to enter the space within. In this respect man's senses are capable of allowing both virtues and vices to penetrate his interior being. Therefore it is imperative that men and women be vigilant at all times and ensure that their senses do not succumb to the evils that besiege them in all directions. At the same time, however, it is necessary that these doors remain open to ensure that goodness and virtue permeate the inward self. Thus, paradoxically, the senses have the capability of leading the human being to his own destruction through sin and vice; at the same time they also serve as doorways to his interior world of spiritual knowledge and understanding.

The number five, furthermore, bears rhetorical significance. The five subjects of Ciceronian rhetoric, *inventio, dispositio, elocutio, pronunciatio, memoria*, are ever present in Dymytrii's way of thinking and writing. His recommendation that "a person should read these every day with his five senses together" reveals a complex system of interrelations that constitute his rhetorical theory. The five senses must work together in the task of spiritual perception, just as the five subjects of rhetoric complement each other and cannot be separated from one another. A rhetorician, Dymytrii is well aware that the rhetorical components of *inventio, dispositio, elocutio, pronunciatio* and *memoria* cannot exist independent of one another. For each of these subjects to be what it is, it must do so in the context of its relationship to the other four. The five-fold unity of the body's senses mirrors the mutual respect and wholeness enjoyed by the five subjects of rhetoric.

---

[366] See my article, "Blood and Tears, Love and Death: Seventeenth-century Devotional Homoeroticism and Tuptalo's 'Verses on the Lord's Passion'," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 38 (1996) nos. 1-2: 61–92.

[367] For more on the allegory of the soul as beseiged city and the five senses as its portals, see Vinge 63–68.

Dymytrii says, "a person should read these every day with his five senses together." But how is this to be accomplished? Eyes and ears are one thing. But how can we read with our smell? Our taste? Our touch? Clearly Dymytrii is speaking of the five senses as not just physiological, but symbolical entities. Since the Classical era sight has traditionally been accorded the first and highest position among the five senses. Dymytrii's own observation that "among all the natural sensibilities, sight is the most treasured and the most joyful to the sighted"[368] suggests that he, too, is following a classical model. But in Medieval times Christian philosophers often praised hearing as the sense of faith and belief: the ears hear God's truth proclaimed and they direct the mind toward faith. Touch has long been associated with sexual intercourse, and Christian philosophers have often associated touch with the act of communion, both in the carnal and in the spiritual sense. Other associations involving the five senses, such as the nose with wind and spirit, abound both in Classical thought and in Christian philosophy. They frequently change and adapt themselves throughout history, testifying to the arbitrary nature of these allegories in Western thought. In the case of Dymytrii such allegories are indeed at work in his poems dedicated to the five senses, some of them easily recognizable, others less so. As a rhetorician he was indeed conscious of the fact that he is working within an arbitrary system, for rhetoric is by its nature an art of shifting position, of constant change and of adaptation to the needs of the audience.

---

[368] «Якоже всѣхъ естественыхъ чувствъ честнѣйшее и радостнѣйшее есть въ видимыхъ зрѣнiе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 310.

Dymytrii entitles his five poems "Verse-Discourses of the Chapter of Five-fold Sensibility" (стіхословія пятичувственныя главы). Each poem consists of a number of verses, and at the beginning of each verse Dymytrii instructs his readers to perform a communicative act and these instructions are repeated throughout the work. Over the course of Dymytrii's five poems the reader appeals to God, he converses with God, he exclaims to him, he says to him, he makes a supplication to him, he cries out to him, he prays to him and he gives thanksgiving to him. In this manner all the verses are to be articulated, or given voice, as the reader proceeds through them. In this way Dymytrii indicates that the soul's sensibility is inextricably linked to the soul's communicative act of prayer. The five-fold sequence ends with the final poem of thanksgiving, "Eucharist" in the original Greek meaning of this word. Thus, the five poems present *memoria* as the task of spiritual perception with the five senses cooperating in a mystical dialogue with the Divine, culminating in the act of Eucharist—the mystery of man's oneness with God.

The First Verse-Discourse: The Soul's Loving Appeal to God

Dymytrii's first verse-discourse (*stikhosloviia*) of five-fold sensibility is entitled "The First Verse-Discourse, That of a loving Appeal to God" (Стіхословія первая: любезнаго къ Богу взыванія). It consists of ten individual verses, each numbered with a corresponding numerical letter from the Slavonic alphabet. This first discourse consists entirely of Dymytrii's selection and arrangement of Psalm verses, and not a single piece of original text is composed by the author. It is an act of rhetorical *dispositio* in its purest and most Baroque sense, for the seventeenth-century rhetorician believed that a work of art is above all else to be judged according to its arrangement. Or, as H. James Jensen explains, "The most important issues in the relationship between mind and art in the Baroque era concern the way in which the mind can impose rational form on the seeming chaos of the worlds of nature and imagination."[369] Inventiveness—the twentieth-century's obsession with original authorship—is secondary to the art of arrangement during the Baroque. As a writer born in the middle of the seventeenth-century, Dymytrii would no doubt hold this to be true. And even more importantly, as demonstrated by the tragic death of Silvestr Medvedev in 1689, Dymytrii was familiar with the risks that accompanied innovation in the conservative religious atmosphere of late seventeenth-century Russia,.

Under the letter А Dymytrii begins by placing here the first three verses of Psalm 18:

> I will love you, O Lord, my strength. The Lord is my firmament and my refuge and my deliverer. My God, my helper, in whom I will hope; my buckler and the horn of my salvation and my protector. I will call unto the Lord so shall I be saved from mine enemies (Ps. 18.1–3).[370]

Under the letter Б Dymytrii places the first two verses of Psalm 84:

---

[369] H. James Jensen 2.

[370] «Возлюблю тя Господи крѣпосте моя: Господь утвержденіе мое, и прибѣжище мое, и избавитель мой. Богъ мой, помощникъ мой, и уповаю на него: защититель мой, и рогъ спасенія моего, и заступникъ мой. Хваля призову Господа, и от брагъ моихъ спасуся»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 434. The above translation is from the Slavonic orginal. The Authorized (King James) Version reads as follows: "I will love you, O Lord, my strength. The Lord is my rock and my fortress and my deliverer. My God, my strength, in whom I will trust; my buckler and the horn of my salvation and my high tower. I will call unto the Lord . . . so shall I be saved from mine enemies."

> How beloved are your dwelling-places, O Lord of hosts! My soul longs and even perishes, for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh are overcome with joy for the living God (Ps. 84.1–2).[371]

Dymytrii's reason for placing these Psalm verses at the beginning of his Five-Sense Poems becomes clear if we remember that the five senses are occupied with the task of perception. The act of perceiving, like all other transitive verbs, requires a direct object, and the selected texts from Psalms 18 and 84 remind the reader that the proper object of man's sensibilities is God. Firmament and refuge are found in the Lord, not in the ephemeral and transient things of the world. Not only does the soul long for and even perish with desire for the Lord, but the heart and the flesh are overcome with joy for the living God. Dymytrii's choice of Psalm verses is not haphazard; rather, he selects these texts carefully to underline the principle idea at work in his Five-Sense Poems. The soul, the heart and the body—that is, all the exterior and interior sensibilities of the individual human being—are to be directed toward a loving dialogue with God.

Under the letter Г Dymytrii adds an instrumental element to the grammatical subject-predicate-object sequence of the human being, his perception and God. An additional instrument is required to ensure that men perceive God properly, and that instrument is the Lord's commandments:

> How I love thy law, O Lord! It is my meditation all the day. How sweet are thy words unto my taste! yea sweeter than honey to my mouth. For this reason I hate every false way. Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path (Ps. 119.98, 103, 128, 105).[372]

---

[371] «Коль возлюбленна селенія твоя Господи силы! Желаетъ и скончивается душа моя во дворы Господни: сердце мое и плоть моя возрадовастася о Бозѣ живѣ»—1: 434. The above translation is from the Slavonic orginal. The Authorized (King James) Version reads: "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God."

[372] «Коль возлюбихъ законъ твой Господи, весь день поученіе мое есть. Коль сладка гортани моему словесы твоя, паче меда устомъ моимъ. Сего ради возненавидѣхъ всякъ путь неправды. Свѣтильникъ ногамъ моима законъ твой, и свѣтъ стезямъ моимъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 434–35.

The sweet-tasting commandments that Christians receive from God are the object of their daily meditation. With sweetness the commandments delight the tongue of the spirit and ensure that the inward human being is mindful of the Lord's law all day long. God's commandments serve as the instrument by which men and women are able to clearly perceive the path to which heaven has called them. In this manner Dymytrii explains how meditation on the Divine law moves the Christian from the taste perception of sweetness to the visual perception of light. The initial delight of the soul's tongue to the taste of the Lord's commandments proceeds to a higher sensibility by which these laws illuminate the spiritual path upon which the human being's invisible feet must travel.

The illumination of man's spiritual path is followed by another visual image when the face of God appears, under the letter Д:

> How good is the Lord of Israel to those of true heart. How manifold is your goodness, which you have laid up for them that fear you; which you have wrought for them that trust in you before the sons of men. You shall hide them in the secret of your countenance from the passions of man (Ps. 73.1; Ps. 31.19–20). My soul confesses unto the Lord and from this is my endurance.[373]

Dymytrii is playing with a double meaning that does not exist in any English translation of Psalm 31. The Slavonic "litso" literally means "face, countenance"; it also means "person, character." Hence the Authorized (King James) Version's "Thou shalt hide them in the secret of thy presence from the pride of man" compares with the translation from Slavonic, "You shall hide them in the secret of your countenance from the passions of man."[374]

---

[373] «Коль благъ Богъ Ізраилевъ правымъ сердцемъ. Коль многое множество благости твоея Господи, юже скрылъ еси боящымся тебе, содѣлалъ еси уповающымъ на тя, предъ сыны человѣческими: скрыеши ихъ въ тайнѣ лица твоего от мятежа человѣческа. Обаче Богови повинися душе моя: яко от тою терпѣніе мое»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 435. The above translation is from the Slavonic orginal. The Authorized (King James) Version reads: "Truly the Lord is good to Israel, even to such as are of a clean heart . Oh how great is thy goodness, which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee; which thou hast wrought for them that trust in thee before the sons of men. Thou shalt hide them in the secret of thy presence from the pride of man."

A collector of dictionaries and a student of lexicography, Dymytrii is well aware of the double meaning. But the important message is that Christians must be mindful at all times of God's presence, for it is through such mindfulness that they are able to navigate the spiritual dangers surrounding them. Even more important is Dymytrii's message that behind the face/presence of God there exists a hiding place cloaked in mystery, for as the Psalmist says, "You shall hide them in the *secret* of your countenance." Those whom God hides in this secret place all share in the quality of true heart. The human heart, which everywhere in Dymytrii's writing is deeply invested with abundant physiological properties and metaphysical possibilities, possesses the key of trueness by which the inward person gains entry into the place of mystery that exists behind God's countenance.

For Dymytrii, the heart is the bridal chamber of the body and the soul. Goodness and trueness are the adornments of this chamber, and it is in the interior chamber of the heart where the body and the soul are joined in love and where the human being burns with love and desire for God. The Song of Solomon's erotic imagery of a bride and bridegroom becoming one flesh on their wedding night is frequently used by Dymytrii to express his soul's desire for an intimate union with God. As he wrote in a letter to a friend named Feoloh:

> In my heart I have been aroused with such a great love for Christ—like a bridegroom desiring union in one flesh with his bride, having such warm love for her. How much more should a man desire to

---

[374] This double meaning of "face/presence" appears throughout the Slavonic Bible. For example, the Prophet Jonah flees from the presence of God; the same word "litso" also indicates that he flees from the countenance of God: «И въставѣ Іона якоже бѣжати въ Ѳарсисѣ от лица Господня.»

> unite with the Lord Christ in a spiritual union—one in spirit with the Lord—and how he should love him warmly.[375]

The erotic sensibilities of Dymytrii's devotional life naturally raise the question of his own sexuality and his relations, or lack of relations, with women. We assume that Dymytrii, a monk, was celibate. His only contacts with women were in a pastoral context: he preached to women in his sermons and ministered to their sacramental and pastoral needs as a priest. Other contacts with women, even his own family members, were evidently non-existent: Sophia Senyk has pointed out that Dymytrii's own sister, Paraskeva, was illiterate;[376] hence, Dymytrii likely had little correspondence, if any, with his female relations. In his own literary works, the female reader is never directly addressed: she is either non-existent, or she is simply included in the category of "men" i.e., "human beings" to whom Dymytrii speaks.

Typical of many seventeenth-century intellectuals, Dymytrii lived and worked in an exclusively homosocial network of male friends, colleagues and companions. His monastic lifestyle, on the one hand, demanded strict abstinence from sexual activity, but on the other hand, it allowed him to develop close, intimate friendships with companions of his own sex.[377] Given that in the seventeenth century a man's emotional loyalties were far more important than his sexual loyalties, the homosocial, perhaps homoerotic, sensibilities of Dymytrii's personal and devotional life should not be discounted.[378]

---

[375] «Любовь же поелику возможно въ сердцѣ своемъ ко Христу пріемлемому возбуждати: яко же бо женихъ, хотяй соединитися невѣстѣ своей въ плоть едину, имать къ ней любовь теплую: кольми паче хотяй соединитися духовнымъ соединеніемъ Христу Господу, во единъ духъ съ Господемъ, долженъ есть того теплѣ возлюбити»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia Kafedral'nye Chernigovskie monastyri: Il'inskii, Eletskii i Borisoglebskii, s prilozheniem nieskol'kikh neizdannykh sochinenii Sv. Dimitriia i mnogikh gramat* (editor unknown) (Chernihiv, 1861)147.

[376] Sophia Senyk, *Women's Monasteries in Ukraine and Belorussia to the Period of Suppressions* (Rome: Orientalia Christiana, 1983) 168.

[377] See my discussion of Dymytrii's sexuality and his homosociality in Bednarsky, "Blood and Tears, Love and Death: Seventeenth-century Devotional Homoeroticism and Tuptalo's 'Verses on the Lord's Passion'," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 38 (1996) nos. 1-2: 61–92.

Whether Dymytrii's devotional sensibilities are hetero- or homoerotic is of secondary interest: the far more important idea presented in the *Alphabet* is that the body and soul desire one another, and together as mystical lovers they yearn for and desire the God who created them. As he writes under the letter S:

> O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee; my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is; To see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary. Because thy loving kindness is better than life, my lips shall praise thee. Thus will I bless thee while I live: I will lift up my hands in thy name. My soul followeth hard after thee; thy right hand upholdeth me (Ps. 63.2–4, 8).[379]

Thus Dymytrii indicates that the human being's desire for God is not a purely spiritual one, nor is it purely intellectual: it is both carnal and spiritual at once. The soul and the flesh together burn with man's longing for God. Man's eyes rejoice upon the sight of God in his sanctuary, his lips speak praise to the Lord and his hands raise themselves in the name of God. Dymytrii's references to the eyes, lips and hands of man are not simply metaphorical, as he is referring to these body parts in a sense that is both physiological and spiritual. The natural state of the human being is one of union and harmony between body and soul. The happy coexistence of these two elements is essential to spiritual well-being, for these two must cooperate as one in the divinely appointed task of directing the human being to heaven. Dymytrii is consciously selecting and arranging the Psalm verses above to demonstrate the role that the five senses play in directing human beings, in their spiritual and carnal fullness, to the knowledge and understanding of God.

---

[378] On the subject of homosocial loyalties in Early Modern Europe see Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) 32.

[379] «Боже, Боже мой, къ тебѣ утренюю: возжада тебе душа моя, коль множицею тебѣ плоть моя, въ земли пустѣ и непреходнѣ и безводнѣ. Тако во святѣмъ явихся тебѣ, видѣти силу твою и славу твою. Яко лучша милость твоя паче животъ: устнѣ мои похвалитъ тя: тако благословлю тя въ животѣ моемъ: и имени твоемъ воздѣжу руцѣ мои. Припле душа моя по тебѣ: мене же пріятъ десница твоя»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 435.

Continuing with the theme of sensible fullness, Dymytrii places the sensibility of taste under the letter з:

> As the deer desires the water springs, so does my soul desire you, O God. My soul thirsts for the mighty living God: when shall I come and appear before the face of God? My prayer unto the God of my life. I will say unto God: you are my protector, why have you forgotten me? Why go I all lamenting while the enemy offends? (Ps. 42.1–2, 8–9.)[380]

Again, we see that the senses work together and complement one another in the task of directing the world to God. The tongue of a deer desiring water conceals a deeper meaning, that of the soul's thirst for the living God.[381] The soul of man thirsts and the human being desires to stand before the face of God. The spiritual tongue that thirsts, the spiritual feet that carry the inward person, the spiritual eyes that gaze upon God's countenance, the spiritual lips that speak to God, the spiritual ears that listen for God's loving dialogue with the interior self—the five senses cooperate with one another, working as one invisible body engaged in the joyful task of seeking the Lord and loving him.

---

[380] «Имже образомъ желаетъ елень на источники водныя: сице желаетъ душа моя къ тебѣ Боже: Возжада душа моя къ Богу крѣпкому живому: когда пріиду и явлюся лицу Божію; Молитва Богу живота моего.Реку Богу: заступникъ мой еси, почто мя забылъ еси; И вскую сѣтуя хожду, внегда оскорбляетъ врагъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 435. The above translation is from the Slavonic orginal. The Authorized (King James) Version reads: "Like a hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God? Yet the Lord will command his loving kindness in the daytime and in the night his song shll be with me and my prayer unto the God of my life. I will say unto God my rock, why has thou forgotten me? why go I mourning because of the oppression of the enemy?"

[381] The deer image from Ps. 42.1 was especially popular in Renaissance emblem books and epigrams. Huston Diehl gives an example from Andrew Willet's *Sacrorum emblematum centuria una* in which this emblem is accompanied by an epigram comparing a man to a deer as follows:

1. as the deer chews cud, the man thinks of God's law;
2. as the deer leaps, the man joys in heaven;
3. as the deer runs swiftly, the man shuns evil;
4. as the deer seeks water, the man seeks faith.

See Huston Diehl, *An Index of Icons in English Emblem Books 1500–1700* (Norman and London: U of Oklahoma P, 1986) 74. For more on emblem books and their influence on Early Modern literary culture see: Yves Giraud, *L'Emblème a la Renaissance* (Paris: Société d'Édition d'Enseignement Supérieur, 1982); Peter M. Daly, *The English Emblem and the Continental Tradition* (New York: AMS Press, 1988); Janusz Pelc, *Obraz-słowo-znak: Studium o emblematach w literaturze staropolskiej* (Warsaw: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1973).

It is possible that Dymytrii indeed saw a relationship between the five senses and the five-fold division of rhetoric; it is also possible that he may not have intended to communicate such a relationship to the readers of his *Alphabet*. However, in the above we see the relationship between the sense of taste and man's desire for God. If *memoria spiritualis*, or mindfulness, is the state of constant desire and love for God, the importance of the tongue in this rhetorical discipline is obvious. The tongue thirsts and the element that it desires is water. Water is associated with the Holy Spirit, present in this element during the sacrament of Baptism and during the blessing of waters on the feast of the Epiphany. Thus the image of the deer thirsting water resounds with Christian imagery surrounding the soul imbibing God's Spirit.

If we pursue further the idea that the sense of taste plays a special part in man's loving and desirous relationship with God, we must observe the central role that the tongue plays in the most loving and intimate act possible between the Christian and God: the sacrament of Communion. To the Early Modern mind the complex interplay between the fleshly organ of the tongue and the spirit contained within, and the solid and liquid elements of bread and wine that contain God's flesh and blood, represented an abundance of neo-Platonic associations demonstrating the ideal of perfect union between the material and spiritual worlds. Hence, the soul's state of mindfulness is one of constant love and communion with the Divine, the sense of taste playing a particularly symbolic role in this branch of the soul's rhetoric.

Elsewhere, the text of the five-sense poems further suggests the possibility of a corresponding relationship between the five-fold division of rhetoric and the five planes of sensory experience. Under the letter И we see the combination of two of these elements, the sense of sight and the rhetorical work of invention:

> The Lord is my light and my salvation: whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid. One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord and to inquire in his temple. When thou saidst, Seek ye my face: my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek (Ps. 27.1, 4, 8).[382]

Dymytrii arranges here three verses from Psalm 27 to indicate a progressive sequence between sensibility, spiritual inquiry and knowledge of God. Sensibility is represented by the light that dispels man's fear and the beauty that compels him to seek the Lord. The crucial step that comes next is the Christan's act of spiritual inquiry, and the rhetorician immediately recognizes this act as one of inventiveness. The fruit of man's inquiry is that he finally beholds the countenance of the God that he seeks.

We are here reminded of Dymytrii's earlier injunction, at the beginning of the *Alphabet*, "Behold the created world and marvel and glorify the Creator of the world. Do not place your sensibilities in the created world, rather, direct your heart and soul to God the Creator."[383] A neo-Platonist, Dymytrii sees beauty operating on different—but not opposing—levels of cosmological hierarchy. There is the visible beauty of God's Creation and there is the invisible beauty of

---

[382] «Господь просвѣщеніе мое и Спаситель мой, кого убоюся; Господь защититель живота моего, от кого устрашуся; Едино просихъ от Господа, то взыщу: еже жити ми въ дому Господни вся дни живота моего, зрѣти ми красоту Господню, и посѣщати храмъ святый его. Взыска тебе лице мое, лица твоего Господи взыщу»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 435.

[383] «Зря тварь, чудися, и Творцу твари славословіе приноси, не къ твари прилагай твоя чувства, но къ Богу Творцу всѣхъ сердце и душу возводи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

God within himself.[384] Theologically, God's immanence in his creation and his transcendence within himself are two aspects of one dynamic process, for "immanence, God's presence in nature, leads man to transcendence, God's presence above and outside earthly things."[385]

As Dymytrii explains under the letter I:

> O Lord, you are my strength. Ignite my inward self and my heart, for your loving kindness is before my eyes. Send down your light and your truth. Teach me and guide me to your holy Mount, to your dwelling place. And I shall go unto God's table of sacrifice, my youth rejoicing in God. I confess unto you with psaltries O God, God of mine. Why are you sorely vexed, O my soul? Why do you trouble me? Place your hope in God, for I have confessed unto him, the salvation of my person and my God. (Ps. 27.1, 4, 8)[386]

Dymytrii selects these Psalm verses to highlight the interplay between the perception of sight and the element of fire. Until the twentieth century, illumination normally required the presence of fire, either in the form of the burning, gaseous sun, or candles, oil lamps, etc. In Christian imagery flames are associated with the Holy Spirit's descent at Pentecost, enlightening the twelve apostles gathered in the upper room. Again, we see how Dymytrii selects and arranges excerpts from the Psalms to convey these rich symbolic associations that communicate the Platonic ideal of perfect union between the material and spiritual worlds. Fire is necessary for illumination, visible fire for outward perception and the invisible fire of the Holy Spirit for inward perception.

---

[384] This idea of a cosmological hierarchy is also typical of Byzantine thought and it has parallels in the Old Rus' narrative concerning St. Volodymyr of Kyiv's conversion. See the essay "Religious Missions Seen from Byzantium" in Ševčenko 41.

[385] Osmond 124.

[386] «Ты еси Боже держава моя, разжзи утробы моя и сердце мое, яко милость твоя пред очима моимъ есть. Посли свѣтъ твой и истину твою: та мя настависта, и введоста мя въ гору святую твою, и въ селенія твоя. И вниду къ жертвеннику Божію, къ Богу веселящему юность мою: исповѣмся тебѣ въ гуслехъ Боже, Боже мой. Вскую прискорбна еси душе моя; вскую смущаеши мя: Уповай на Бога, яко исповѣмся ему, спасеніе лица моего, и Богъ мой»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 435.

The soul that is troubled and vexed remedies its spiritual unhappiness with its tongue, confessing its hope and trust in God in whom the human being finds salvation. Therefore, a certain harmony between man's inward and outward sensibilities is required if he is to acquire both physical and spiritual wholeness.

The distinction between outward and inward sensibility in Dymytrii's *Alphabet* suggests even further similarities with Augustine. According to George Howie, Augustine saw interior sense as a middle player in the task of relating the body's perceptions to the mind:

> The interior sense is seen as an intermediary between the several senses and the reason. When we reach back from the senses to the interior sense, we have passed the boundary of the physical world. The senses are physical and belong to the body; the interior sense on the other hand is immaterial and belongs to the soul. The interior sense, however, differs from reason in that its perception falls short of knowledge, which is the province of reason alone:
>
> "Unless the information conveyed to us by the senses of the body goes beyond that sense (the interior sense), it cannot become knowledge" (Augustine, *The Free Will* 2: 9).[387]

Dymytrii's Five-Sense Poems remind his readers that at all times the senses of the body and the senses of the soul must cooperate in the task of spiritual perception. If not, the human being will suffer the consequences of a spiritually inattentive mind. To acquire spiritual mindfulness the Christian must maintain good judgement and clarity of his inward sensibilities, and at all times direct his heart and memory to God. As Dymytrii said at the very beginning of his *Alphabet*:

---

[387] Howie 76–77.

> At all times unceasingly direct your mind and soul to God; and at no time let him out of your heart and memory so that always you shall be as one with him.[388]

The Second Verse-Discourse: The Soul's Loving Conversation with God

Dymytrii's second poem of five-fold sensibility is entitled "The Second Verse-Discourse, That of a loving conversation with God" (Стіхословія вторая: любезнаго къ Богу бесѣдованія). The second poem introduces a ten-part alphabetical structure that will be repeated in poems three and four. In Slavic literature the composition of verse in alphabetic form is an ancient practice derived from medieval sources.[389] Dymytrii's Baroque version follows the syllabic structure universally accepted by Ukrainian and Russian poets at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries.[390] The syllabic versification employed by Dymytrii and his contemporaries was based on a Polish model developed during the sixteenth century. According to this model there are either an equal number of syllables in every line of a poem, or a regular appearance of lines of equal length. The lines are connected by rhyme, normally in two consecutive lines. Like the Polish model, Ukrainian and Russian syllabic verse employed feminine rhymes exclusively: one accented followed by one unaccented syllabic line. In long lines (thirteen syllables or more) a caesura is used to help support the rhythmic structure. In long lines the end of a word must always follow after a certain syllable to ensure these lines are consistently broken into shorter units. Syllabic poetry allowed the use of multiple stanzas, and especially popular was the "Sapphic stanza" consisting of three eleven-syllable and one five-syllable lines, the eleven syllable line having a caesura after the fifth syllable.

---

[388] «Къ Богу всегда умъ твой и душу непрестанно возводи, и никогдаже его от сердца и памяти твоей испускай, яко да всегда съ нимъ соединенъ будеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[389] See Kuev, *Azbuchna molitva v slavianskite literaturi.*

[390] See Dmitrij Tschizewskij, *A History of Russian Literature from the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque* ('s-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1960) 350–51. Also helpful are: Halyna Sydorenko, *Virshuvannia v ukrainskii literaturi* (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1962) 23–96; V. Kholshevnikov, ed., *Teoriia stikha* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1968), particularly the three essays on syllabic verse by V. Kholshevnikov (24–58), A. Panchenko (280–93) and P. Berkov (294–316). On the origin of Polish syllabic verse see Maria Dłuska, *Studia z historii i teorii wersyfikacji polskiej* (Warsaw: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1978) 2: 177–239.

Dymytrii's use of a ten-part structure in his verse-discourses numbers two, three and four raises many symbolic possibilities derived from neo-Pythagorean numerical symbolism. A humanist, Dymytrii considered the boundaries between philosophy, theology and the natural sciences as permeable; hence, the division of his verses into decimal units of ten makes sense both in the context of arithmetic and of prosody. No seventeenth-century rhetorician would have overlooked the symbiotic relationship between the natural sciences and theology. All the numbers in the universe can be organized into groups of tens, and all things visible and invisible are arranged numerically. Even the title of Dymytrii's book, the *Spiritual Alphabet*, bears mathematical consideration when we remember that the Slavonic alphabet is used not only for spelling, but also for counting. When a child learns this alphabet, he also acquires the ability not only to arrange sounds into meaningful words and sentences, but also to express numbers and to arrange them into mathematical equations. As arithmetic reveals God's sense of order and proportion, so also the natural sciences affirm that the created world represents the ideal model of rhetorical *dispositio*.

The second poem markedly differs from the first poem in that the first poem bears the description "a loving appeal to God" and consists of Psalm verses only, with no original text being introduced by the author. The second poem is described as a conversation (*besedovaniia*) with God, and this description signals to us that a different kind of communicative function is about to take place. An appeal is a one-way communicative act: although an appeal requires a recipient, the words and the actions taken are those of the one making the appeal. A conversation, by contrast, is a two-way communicative act involving the sense of physical perception that is most essential to the art of communicating: hearing.

Assuming that Dymytrii follows the Classical order of the five senses (i.e., sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch), the second of the Five-Sense Poems does indeed reveal the special role that hearing plays in task of spiritual perception. The second poem is the first in which Dymytrii places a communicative instruction at the beginning of each numbered stanza. The resulting structure resembles the liturgical exclamation "Again and again let us pray . . . " that precedes each minor litany in Orthodox worship:

> (а) "Fervently exclaim to Christ, saying . . . " (Усерднѣ ко Христу возопій глаголя);
>
> (в) "Again, lovingly say to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу любезнѣ глаголи);
>
> (г) "Again, warmly exclaim to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу теплѣ вопій);
>
> (д) "Again, fervently appeal to God . . . " (Паки усерднѣ къ Богу взывай);
>
> (є) "Again, attentively pray to the Lord . . . " (Паки прилѣжно Господа моли);
>
> (з) "Again, make a supplication to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу мольбу сотвори);
>
> (и) "Again, warmly say to the Lord . . . " (Паки теплѣ ко Господу рцы);
>
> (ѳ) "Again, without silence cry out to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу немолчно восклицай);

> (ї) "Again, attentively make a supplication to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу прилѣжно мольбу сотвори).

Of special significance is Dymytrii's instruction under the letter ѳ (= numerical 9), "without *silence* cry out to God." As we have seen in chapter three, Dymytrii typically associates dumbness—that, is lack of speech—with spiritual paralysis.[391] Conversely, spiritual quickness is associated with the act of speaking, i.e., making meaningful sounds with one's mouth.

To the Early Modern rhetorician, speech is like alchemy, whereby one element is changed to another, for in the act of speaking silence is changed into meaningful utterance. But to effect an alchemic change, a third substance is required—the philosopher's stone (*lapis philosphicus*). In the second Five-Sense Poem we see the fundamental role that sound plays in the alchemy of spiritual perception. Prayer must be given voice: man's tongue and lips articulate the sounds of faithful supplication audible to his ears. The element that carries sound is air, thus just as fire provides the illumination that transforms spiritual darkness into light in Dymytrii's first poem, air carries the speech that transforms silence into loving conversation with the Divine.

The loving conversation described in the title of the second Five-Sense Poem is, of course, a two-way auditory exchange between the believer and heaven. God himself and his saints and angels hear the prayers of men and women. But in Dymytrii's poem, the imperative instructions ("exclaim"; "say"; "appeal"; "pray"; "make a supplication"; "cry out") are exclusively concerned with the active voice of the believer in the spiritual dialogue. Dymytrii never gives the instruction "listen!" in the imperative commands that precede each of the poem's stanzas. Presumably, however, if the reader has properly digested the instructions from the first poem ("How I love thy law, O Lord! It is my meditation all the day. How sweet are thy words unto my taste!") he should in fact already be attending to God's words, as given in the commandments. Thus, the second Five-Sense Poem is concerned with one side of the communicative equation, that of the believer giving voice to one's faith. The act of arranging words into prayers and delivering them to God is a sensible demonstration of faith, for if the Christian did not believe in God he would not engage in this exercise. In this respect Dymytrii calls his readers to become rhetoricians of spiritual dialogue, engaging their lips and tongues in the articulation of their faith.

---

[391] See my discussion of Rachel's Lament in chapter three.

Hearing, however, is only one of the senses. And Dymytrii is aware that hearing cannot be relied upon alone, for the other four senses must also be consulted in the task of spiritual perception. Hence, although the second poem does indeed assign a special role to the hearing in spiritual sensibility, it does adhere to Dymytrii's instruction that the five poems are to be read with all the five senses together.

We see the five senses at work in the three prayers that constitute four of the ten alphabetic stanzas of the second poem. Dymytrii's prayers merit special consideration, for prayer is the soul's act of speaking and as a Latin-schooled philologist Dymytrii is doubtless aware of the double meaning assigned to the Latin verb *orare*, meaning both "to speak" and "to pray."

Dymytrii composes the second poem's first prayer and places it under the letter є:

> Ignite my inward self and my heart, for your loving kindness is before my eyes. Ignite my inward self and my heart, O God of my life. Ignite and soften my soul, let all these things languish and pour themselves before you, O Lord. Let me be entirely in you and you in me, O my giver of Grace. Let me be united with you, my God and never estranged from you and your divine love.[392]

---

[392] «Разжзи утробы моя и сердце мое, яко милость твоя предъ очима моима есть. Разжзи утробы моя и сердце мое, Боже живота моего, разжзи и умягчи душу мою, яко да вся истаеть, и излiется предъ товою Господи, да весь буду

In this prayer we see Dymytrii's continuity with the Psalm verses that he arranged in the first poem. The fire imagery of Psalm 27, introduced at the end of the first poem as symbolic of the soul's desire for God, reappears in this prayer. However, the second poem is about spiritual dialogue and Dymytrii uses the element of fire here to represent more than just the soul's desire for God, but the consummation of this desire of man's union with the Divine. Hence, like a verbal dialogue, the role of the two players is essential. Whereas the first poem focused on the believer's perception of God through the Lord's commandments, the second poem emphasizes the reciprocal nature of man's relationship with God. The Lord is not a passive recipient of man's desire, he is responsive to this desire, thereby emphasizing the mutual love and respect existing between the believer and God.

Dymytrii's use of erotic imagery ("Let me be entirely in you and you in me, O my giver of Grace. Let me be united with you, my God and never estranged from you and your divine love") is in keeping with his devotional writing. The idea of an erotic union with God has long been a tradition in Christianity, both Eastern and Western, and it is central to Dymytrii's devotional life.[393] *Memoria spiritualis* is an erotic intercourse between the soul and God. Like any erotic relationship, it is reciprocal: God offers himself to man and man offers himself to God in return.

The erotic element in Dymytrii's approach to *memoria* is not surprising, considering that Stefan Iavorsky's *Rhetorical Hand* associates the fourth

---

въ тебѣ, ты же во мнѣ Благодателю мой. Да сице съ тобою, Богомъ моимъ соединенъ бывъ, никогдаже от тебе и Божественныя твоя устраняюся»— Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 438.

[393] The erotic element of Dymytrii's devotional life and its context within Early Modern religious literature is the subject of my article, "Blood and Tears, Love and Death." See especially the theoretical model proposed on pages 61–70.

rhetorical subject *memoria* (Slavonic: *pamiat'*) with the fourth finger—the finger that wears the wedding band. As Iavorsky explains, the "ring finger by means of a ring betroths wisdom."[394] Thus spiritual mindfulness is not an act of individual will, for it requires that the speaker bind himself unto the spouse of eloquence, wisdom.

Note the sensibility that accompanies Dymytrii's use of erotic imagery. The fire imagery used in the first poem reappears in the second. However, the erotic sensibilities of the second poem play on the sense of touch. The fire in the above prayer is not just an illuminating fire, but it also a warming fire that softens the soul. Since Classical times the sense of touch has been associated with sexual intercourse and in Dymytrii's five-sense poems this particular plane of sensory experience holds special significance for the soul's erotic union with God.

The opposite of union is estrangement and spiritual estrangement is accompanied by the dumbness and obscurity that torments the unfortunate soul that does not know God. The consequences of such estrangement are made clear when Dymytrii continues his prayer, under the letter ѕ:

> O where does my soul find certainty from death, where does my mind find refuge, where does my heart find constant stillness and rest, if not with you, O Lord, if you yourself do not give my soul rest and grant me eternal comfort. For all the joy of this world is but mourning; all its comfort is but grief and suffering; all the earth's delights are but sorrow and a burden to the soul; all love of the flesh is but falsehood and hypocrisy. Not a single delight of this world is natural and familiar to my soul; you alone are my joy, my happiness and my eternal delight unto all ages.[395]

---

[394] «Перстъ перстневыи перстнемъ обручаетъ премудрость»—Iavors'kyi, 11.

[395] «Гдѣ бо моей души имать быти непремѣнное от почиванiе; Гдѣ уму пристанище; Гдѣ сердцу непреложнная тишина и покой, аще не въ тебѣ Господи, аще не ты самъ душу мою упокоиши, и присносущное утѣшенiе даруеши; Всяка бо мiра сего радость, плачь есть: всяко утѣшенiе его, скорбь и печаль: всяко наслажденiе земное, горесть и тяжесть души: всяка любовь плотская ложь есть и лицемѣрiе: нѣсть свойственна и извѣстна души моей

Confusion is the result when man's sensibilities and perceptions depend upon the material world. The conflicting messages of the world bring distress to the inward person: the soul fears death, the mind is afflicted, the heart finds never-ending chaos and affliction. We must remember, however, that here the author is speaking of false joy, false comfort, false delight and false love. True joy, comfort, delight and love are gifts from heaven, but to discern them the human being requires perception, judgement and understanding.

In the above passage the soul-mind-heart triad that constitutes the interior person is especially noteworthy. This triad is in accordance with Jesus' commandment "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind" (Matt. 22.37). In Dymytrii's soul-mind-heart triad we also discern certain features common to the neo-Platonic tripartite soul. The soul and mind of Dymytrii's triad readily correspond to the animative soul and reasoning soul of neo-Platonism. The soul and the mind are invisible—our five senses are unable to perceive their presence directly. Only through the mediation of reason and understanding can the perceptions lead one to conclude, for example, that "this man is animate" or "this person possesses intellect." By contrast, the third member of Dymytrii's interior triad—the heart—can be immediately perceived by man's hearing and touch. The heart possesses flesh and blood and the human being's ears and sense of touch directly perceive its beating.

For this reason Dymytrii assigns the heart a special position in the interior life of the human being. This organ exists in both worlds—it is a fleshly member that dwells at the core of the human body and it is a spiritual entity that plays a

---

ни едина міра сего сладость: но ты единъ да будеши ми радость и веселіе и вѣчное присносущное наслажденіе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 438–39.

central role in the invisible world of the interior person. Because the heart exists at the intersection of the body and the soul, it is the precise location where the physical and spiritual meet one another. Like a bridal chamber, the heart serves as the interior location wherein the body and the soul harmoniously unite with one another in a setting of love and mutual respect. Like any other religious mystic of the Baroque, Dymytrii considers the human heart's physiology inseparable from its spiritual attributes. The heart is indeed a fleshly, bloody mass of muscle and tissue and at the same time it is the dwelling place of the spirit. Rhetorically the heart embodies—in the carnal and in the figurative sense of embodiment—the very idea of paradox.

Dymytrii's next prayer takes these two ideas—man's erotic union with God and the central role of the human heart in man's interior life—and he connects them as one. Under the letter з he writes:

> May I not in my heart commit adultery with the created world against you, O Lord, but instead, may bond unto you the creator of all creation with my heart. May I not honor anyone higher than you. May I not love anyone, other than you, my Lord, the source of life. May I not love the glory of this world and its transient wealth, nor its corruptible beauty, nor the temporal delights of the flesh. Rather, may you alone be my glory and honor, my wealth and treasure, my nourishment and drink and my eternal comfort.[396]

In the above we see that the relationship between the inward human being and God is a monogamous one: to bond oneself with the world is spiritual adultery. In this respect the soul's relationship to God is theologically based on the model of Christ's relationship to his Church—there is one Divine Bridegroom and one all-pure bride. Therefore the erotic nature of this relationship goes hand-in-hand with the dignity and chastity accorded to it by virtue of its divine origin.

---

[396] «Да не любодѣствую въ сердцѣ моемъ от тебе Господа моего съ тварію, но да всѣмъ сердцемъ моимъ прилѣпляюся тебѣ, всю тварь сотворшему. Да ничтоже предпочитаю паче тебе. Да ничтоже возлюблю, кромѣ тебе Господа моего, источника жизни. Да не возлюблю славы міра сего, и богатства исчезновеннаго, ни красоты тлѣнныя, ни наслажденія плотскаго временнаго: но ты единъ да будеши моя слава и похвала, богатство и окорвище, пища и питіе, и присносущное утѣшеніе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 439.

We also see that the human heart is the location—indeed the bed chamber—wherein the soul offers herself unto God. Conversely, the heart is also the place wherein spiritual adultery is committed. Dymytrii's reason for assigning the heart this special function is doubtless theological: if the human heart is the embodiment of the two elements of body and spirit that compose man, it is the proper location for man's complete union with God in a responsive personal relationship based on mutual love and respect. The unfaithful soul betrays its spousal responsibility and rather than serving as a pure bed chamber of divine love, the heart becomes soiled with worldly vanity.

Concerning spiritual adultery we must consider the identity of the third party involved in the soul's adulterous liaison: the created world. The created world is the work of God's hand and it was created to give service and glory unto the Lord. The soul that commits adultery with the world is not committing this offence with an enemy of God, but with God's own servant. Hence, the impropriety of this act bears cosmological significance. Just as a bride brings disorder into her home by abandoning marital chastity and committing adultery with her husband's servant, so too does the faithless soul bring chaos and strife into the world when she fails to honor the sacred bond that unites her unto God.

We also observe Dymytrii's return to the sensibility of taste in this prayer: "may you alone be my glory and honor, my wealth and treasure, my nourishment and drink." Like in the first poem, Dymytrii's references to taste in the second poem does not overtly refer to the sacrament of Communion. However, Dymytrii's readers would have immediately recognized Jesus' words of institution ("Take, eat; this is my body . . . Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood"—Matt. 26.26–27) in these references to nourishment and drink. Hence alongside the Classical association of erotic intercourse with the sense of touch, Dymytrii's rhetoric also delights in the possibilities offered by the sensibility of taste to symbolize man's union with God.

The second poem ends with a final prayer:

> Illumine me with the light of your understanding, O God of mine! Enlighten my darkened soul, inflame and ignite my heart and my inward self, like a fire for your Divine love, O my Creator. May I at all times glorify, magnify and sing unto your most holy name and your ineffable love of humanity, for you are always merciful and benevolent and protective of those who place their hope and trust in you. For unto you is due all glory, honor and worship with your eternal Father and with your most holy, good and life-giving Spirit, now and forever and unto the ages of ages. Amen.[397]

At the beginning of the second verse-discourse Dymytrii identified this poem as a conversation (*besedovaniia*). Therefore the final prayer provides closure to a communicative act of spiritual dialogue. We observe that this prayer consists of two parts: supplication followed by doxology. In this manner the two-way dynamic of interior dialogue is underlined: the Christian beseeches God with his supplications and in return he offers unto God due glory, honor and worship. In this manner men and women are always mindful of their obligations to God and of his benevolent love. As always, the body's senses play a central role in this *memoria* of the soul. God's understanding is light that illuminates the darkened soul, directs it away from the obscurity and falseness of the transient world and shows the inward man the eternal joys and comforts of heaven. The enlightened soul responds sensibly as the cold heart is ignited and inflamed with Divine love. Words of glory, praise are articulated by the lips and tongue and man's breath brings forth song that is audible, meaningful and pleasing to God.

---

[397] «Возсіяй ми свѣтъ твоего разума, О Боже мой! Просвѣти мрачную ми душу, распали и разжзи сердце мое и уртобы моя, яко огнь къ Божественной твоей любви, о создателю мой! Да выну славлю, величаю, и воспѣваю твое пресвятое имя, и неизреченое человѣколюбіе: яко ты насъ присно милуеши, ущедряеши, и защищаеши уповающихъ и надѣющихся на тя. Яко тебѣ подобаетъ всякая слава, честь и поклоненіе со безначальнымъ ти Отцемъ и пресвятымъ и благимъ и животворящимъ твоимъ Духомъ, нынѣ и присно, и во вѣки вѣковъ, аминь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 440.

The Third Verse-Discourse: The Soul's Zealous Exclamation to God

Dymytrii's third verse-discourse of five-fold sensibility is entitled "The Third Verse-Discourse, That of a zealous exclamation to God" (Стіхословія третія: рачительнаго къ Богу вопіенія). It repeats the ten-part structure of the second poem and each of the ten individual verses is also preceded by an imperative instruction to perform a communicative act:

> (а) "Fervently exclaim to Christ, saying . . . " (Усерднѣ ко Христу возопій глаголя) (same as 2а);
>
> (в) "Again, warmly exclaim to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу теплѣ вопій) (same as 2г);
>
> (г) "Again, fervently appeal to Christ . . . " (Паки ко Христу усерднѣ взывай);
>
> (д) "Again, without silence cry out to the Lord . . . " (Паки къ Господу немолчно восклицай);
>
> (є) "Again, warmly exclaim to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу теплѣ вопій) (same as 2г and 3в);
>
> (ѕ) "Again, warmly say to the Lord . . . " (Паки теплѣ ко Господу рцы) (same as 2и);
>
> (з) "Again, warmly exclaim to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу теплѣ вопій) (same as 2г and 3в and 3є);
>
> (и) "Again, lovingly say to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу любезнѣ глаголи) (same as 2в);
>
> (ѳ) "Again, fervently appeal to God . . . " (Паки усерднѣ къ Богу взывай) (same as 2д);

(ї) "Again, attentively pray to the Lord . . . " (Паки прилѣжно Господа моли) (same as 2ε).

Like the second poem, the third poem concludes with a prayer that consists of a supplication followed by a doxology:

> For thus shall I entreaty your inward goodness, O my Creator and Lord! Accept me with your holy love and enlighten my soul. Brighten my understanding, O my Giver of Grace. Let my soul be wounded with your Divine love and let my heart be punctured, let me be firmly bound and held captive entirely by your Divine love and desire. Let all the parts of my entire soul be pierced and penetrated, so that not a single part, not a single chamber of my soul be left untouched. Let all the locks of my soul be opened, let all my senses be enlightened, let my soul be affirmed and comforted, let my entire self exist in you and you in me. Let me praise, sing and magnify your most holy name with your eternal Father and with your most holy, good and life-giving Spirit, now and forever and unto the ages of ages. Amen.[398]

Whereas the second poem's doxology offered glory, honor, worship, this third poem's doxology offers praise, singing and laudation. Dymytrii describes the third poem as "that of a zealous exclamation to God."[399] The second poem's doxology ("For unto you is due all glory, honor and worship with your eternal Father and with your most holy, good and life-giving Spirit, now and forever and unto the ages of ages") is identical to those that conclude the Great Litany at the beginning of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and the Litany of the

---

[398] «Но убо молю твое благоутробіе, О Создателю мой Господи! Пріими мя въ любовь твою святую, просвѣти мою душу. Уясни мой разумъ, О Благодателю мой. Да уранитмися твоею Божественною любовію душа, да уязвенно будетъ мое сердце, да свяжется ею крѣпцѣ, и плѣненна будетъ вся въ твое Божественное желаніе и любовь. Да пронзетъ и проничетъ всю душу мою, всѣхъ частей да ни едина часть, ни едина клѣть души моей останетъ кромѣ ея. Да отверзеши вся заклепы души моея, да просвѣтиши вся моя чувства, да утвердиши и упокоиши сія въ душѣ моей, да весь буду въ тебѣ, ты же во мнѣ. Да твое пресвятое имя славлю, воспѣваю и величаю. Со безначальнымъ твоимъ Отцемъ и пресвятымъ и благимъ и животворящимъ твоимъ Духомъ, нынѣ и присно, и во вѣки вѣковъ, аминь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 446.

[399] «. . . рачительнаго къ Богу вопіенія»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 441.

Catechumens.[400] The third poem's doxology ("Let me praise, sing and magnify your most holy name with your eternal Father and with your most holy, good and life-giving Spirit, now and forever and unto the ages of ages")[401] is comparable to the doxology that concludes the Eucharistic Anaphora of this same Liturgy ("And grant that with one voice and one heart we may glorify and praise thine most honorable and majestic name . . . ").[402] Whereas the second poem's doxology is in the third person singular the third poem's doxology is in the first person singular. Thus, grammatically, the focus of the third poem is on the individual believer's personal exclamation to God, in contrast to the second poem's focus on dialogue.

Regarding the sensibility of zealous exclamation, Dymytrii repeats the light imagery that has been constant throughout the poems: "Accept me with your holy love and enlighten my soul. Brighten my understanding, O my Giver of Grace." And once again, just as Dymytrii associates vision with spiritual understanding, he at the same time associates the sense of touch with communion, both carnal and spiritual:

> Let my soul be wounded with your Divine love and let my heart be punctured, let me be firmly bound and held captive entirely by your Divine love and desire. Let all the parts of my entire soul be pierced and penetrated, so that not a single part, not a single chamber of my soul be left untouched. Let all the locks of my soul be opened, let all my senses be enlightened, let my soul be affirmed and comforted, let my entire self exist in you and you in me.[403]

---

[400] «Яко тебѣ подобаетъ всякая слава, честь и поклоненіе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 440. This doxology occurs elsewhere, including the Great Litanies at Vespers and Matins. It also concludes several of the prayers that the priest reads silently during the Divine Liturgy, Vespers and Matins.

[401] «Да твое пресвятое имя славлю, воспѣваю и величаю»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 446.

[402] «И даждь намъ единѣми усты и единѣмъ сердцемъ славити и воспѣвати пречестное и великолѣпое имя твое . . . »—John Krashkevich, ed., *The Orthodox Prayer Book* , 3rd ed. (South Canaan: St. Tikhon's P, 1975) 245.

[403] «Да уранитмися твоею Божественною любовію душа, да уязвенно будетъ мое сердце, да свяжется ею крѣпцѣ, и плѣненна будетъ вся въ твое

The above passage provides us with several extraordinary insights into Dymytrii's psychology of the human soul. Firstly, we see that it is proper and desirable that the soul should suffer for the love of God. What Dymytrii is speaking of here is not suffering as a form of punishment, but as accompaniment to love. As a lover is pained with desire for his beloved, so too does the soul painfully long for union with God. Painful wounded love for the sake of God is characteristic of Dymytrii's devotional life and it is particularly vivid in his devotional poetry on the subject of the Lord's Passion. Dymytrii does not write from the perspective of a religious masochist, but from that of a man sincerely moved by God's love and filled with the desire to be consumed in God's love. This kind of desire is so strong—indeed overwhelming—that it brings an interior suffering that is both painful and delightful to the individual from whom it flows.

Secondly, Dymytrii's repeated use of imagery related to puncturing, piercing and penetrating reveals both the process by which the soul is wounded and also the physical properties of the soul that allow it to be opened up in this manner. The imagery is highly erotic for Dymytrii depicts the soul as a bride desiring her bridegroom on her wedding night—an image obviously taken from the Song of Solomon.

The erotic dynamic of the soul's interaction with God furthermore reveals the physical properties enjoyed by the soul. Like the bride on her wedding night, she desires union with her Divine Bridegroom. The soul is the recipient of Divine grace and love, just as seventeenth-century physiology believed the

---

Божественное желаніе и любовь. Да пронзетъ и проничетъ всю душу мою, всѣхъ частей да ни едина часть, ни едина клѣть души моей останетъ кромѣ ея. Да отверзеши вся заклепы души моея, да просвѣтиши вся моя чувства, да утвердиши и упокоиши сія въ душѣ моей, да весь буду въ тебѣ, ты же во мнѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 446.

woman to be a fertile ground into which her husband's seed is planted. The soul is penetrable and accommodating to God's love and desire and she provides a comfortable dwelling for Divine grace.

Not only is the soul wounded, but so too is the heart punctured and indeed, the entire person is firmly bound and held captive by Divine love and desire. Thus the dynamic of the soul's erotic interaction with God spreads throughout the entire person, both inward and outward. In this respect the heart, the soul and the body are inextricably linked as an organic unit—that which is felt in the heart is felt in the soul and throughout the entire body. The wellness of the individual human being depends upon the wellness of his component parts: if the heart is not sound and pure, nor can the mind and body.

Bondage and captivity, of course, are the opposite of emancipation and liberty. Herein lies the essential paradox of Dymytrii's Christian psychology and wherever there is paradox, Dymytrii knows that spiritual wisdom is invariably found. By accepting divine love, the Christian exchanges one form of bondage for another: rather than being subject to the world, he instead accepts captivity in the love of God. Theologically, Dymytrii's is here echoing St. Paul's injunction, "wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord" (Eph. 5.22) Just as the Divine Bridegroom offers himself to his All-Pure Bride, the Church and she responds accordingly with obedience and servitude, so too does God offer himself to men and women and it is proper that they render service unto him, for they are bonded and held captive by his love.

Another extraordinary feature of the above prayer is Dymytrii's reference to the multiple parts of the soul. His plea, "let . . . not a single chamber of my soul be left untouched" begs comparison with his words concerning the inward chamber of the human heart, discussed in the previous chapter of this thesis. Clearly the heart and the soul are not only linked, but they also share the characteristic of being multi-chambered structures. Naturally, if the heart is to be the joining place of the body and soul, it must accommodate the soul in a comfortable manner; hence, the heart's multiple chambers mirror those of the soul.

Chambers, of course, require doors and doors require locks. Dymytrii's entreaty, "Let all the locks of my soul be opened" again underlines the highly erotic nature of the soul's desire for God. The act of opening up, or physical penetration—like a key opening a lock—is characteristic of seventeenth-century devotional poetry and its ability to express spiritual desire with the use of carnal imagery.[404] At the same time, however, Dymytrii also reveals that the soul's chambers possess entry points that cannot be opened unless the appropriate key is employed to unlock these doors. The locks of the soul are its spiritual barriers and throughout Dymytrii's sermons he reminds his readers that the greatest obstacles to spiritual happiness are the ones that lie within. The keys to man's inward locks are held by God, for it is the Lord to whom Dymytrii directs his entreaty. To unlock the chambers of the soul all that is required is faith. If Christians turn to God in faith, they are assured that the interior locks that prohibit entry into their inward selves will be opened up, allowing self-knowledge and the fullness of Divine grace to enter.

In Dymytrii's prayer the unlocking of the soul's chambers is accompanied by three other events: 1) the enlightenment of all the senses; 2) the affirmation and comfort of the soul; 3) the existence of the self in God and of God in the self. By permitting God to enter the chambers of the soul, the Christian at the same time effects the enlightening of his sensibilities. Concurrently, the act of unlocking provides the soul with affirmation and comfort. Conversely, it follows that the soul whose chambers remain steadfastly shut is afflicted with doubt and unhappiness.

---

[404] See Richard Rambuss's essay, "Pleasure and Devotion: The Body of Jesus and Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric" in *Queering the Renaissance*, ed. Jonathan Goldberg (Durham: Duke UP, 1994) 253–79.

The opening up of the soul's chambers entails a kind of *kenosis*, or emptying of oneself. Theologically, Dymytrii is once again modeling the soul's relationship to God on the sacrament of marriage.[405] In Dymytrii's prayer the soul's locks function as containers of the self and these containers must be broken if the self is to surrender to God's love. Individuality must be sacrificed and the self must be both immersed in God and filled with God's presence. Dymytrii understands that for the human being to be truly whole one's individuality must die and one's personhood must be born in a community of Divine love.

The Fourth Verse-Discourse: The Soul's Desirous Crying out to God

Dymytrii's fourth poem of five-fold sensibility is entitled "The Fourth Verse-Discourse, That of a desirous crying out to God" (Стіхословія четвертая: желательнаго къ Богу восклицанія). The poem thus is presented as a communicative act motivated by desire. The fourth poem bears the same arrangement as the second poem, that is ten stanzas preceded by a communicative injuction in the imperative:

---

[405] The Orthodox rite of matrimony confers upon the wedded couple the dignity of holy martyrs, for the act of marriage entails a sacrificial love in which the spouses become God's martyrs for each other. Orthodox theologians speak of marriage as the death of individuality and the discovery of personhood. See John Chrysostom's "Homily XX on Ephesians 5.22–33" in *St. John Chrysostom On Marriage and Family Life*, trans. Catharine Roth and David Anderson (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary P, 1986) 43–64. See also John Meyendorff, *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary P, 1975).

(а) [not preceeded by an instruction]

(в) "Again, without silence cry out to the Lord . . . " (Паки къ Господу немолчно восклицай) (same as 2ѳ c.f. 3д);

(г) "Again, warmly exclaim to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу теплѣ вопій) (same as 2г and 3в and 3є and 3з);

(д) "Again, lovingly say to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу любезнѣ глаголи) (same as 2в and 3и);

(є) "Again, fervently appeal to God . . . " (Паки усерднѣ къ Богу взывай) (same as 2д and 3ѳ);

(ѕ) "Again, warmly say to the Lord . . . " (Паки теплѣ ко Господу рцы) (same as 2и and 3ѕ);

(з) "Again, attentively pray to the Lord . . . " (Паки прилѣжно Господа моли);

(и) "Again, warmly exclaim to God . . . " (Паки къ Богу теплѣ вопій) (same as 2г and 3в and 3є and 3з and 4г);

(ѳ) "Again, without silence cry out to the Lord . . . " (Паки къ Господу немолчно восклицай) (same as 2ѳ c.f. 3д and 4в);

(ї) "Again, fervently appeal to God . . . " (Паки усерднѣ къ Богу взывай) (same as 2д and 3ѳ and 4є).

Again we see how Dymytrii imitates a liturgical structure familiar to him and to his readers. First of all, this may be simply a question of rhetorical invention—to construct a devotional work Dymytrii would have required a model and the liturgy readily provided him with one. But by doing so, he also succeeded in reaching his audience through a rhetorical structure that was familiar to them in the liturgy. For Dymytrii the most important concern is that the students of his *Alphabet* should pray, for without the exercise of prayer, the theoretical and pedagogical concepts of his rhetorical program mean nothing. In his attempt to move his students to do this, it is only natural that he should imitate liturgical formulas that facilitate his audience's understanding, thereby ensuring that his message is as persuasive as possible.

Unlike the previous verse-discourse, the third one's prayer occurs not at the end of the discourse but in the middle, under the letter з where the reader receives the instruction to pray to the Lord attentively (Паки прилѣжно Господа моли). In Slavonic the letter з has the numerical value of "seven." Symbolically this number represents the seven sacraments and the sacramental action of the Holy Spirt is indeed invoked twice in this prayer that constitutes the seventh verse:

> O God of mine, fill my soul with your Divine love! Pour your most holy lovingkindess upon me, bedew [me] with the water of your most Holy Spirit. Give me the water of your most holy grace, O Lord, "give me this water, that I thirst not" (John 4.15), nor enter into the corruption of this well of delight, this cursed well of Jacob: for all who drink from this water of earthly delights shall thirst again. But whosoever drinks from the water of your grace, that which you give yourself, shall never thirst. For in him shall be a spring of water flowing for life eternal, that is, the Holy Spirit. Let me partake of the Divine water of your Grace, for "I shall be satisfied when I awake, with thy glory" (Ps. 17.15).[406]

On the subject of spiritual alchemy, we see that Dymytrii again employs the element of water as the medium of desire. In Classical order the fourth of the five senses is taste and accordingly Dymytrii's fourth poem highlights this plane of sensibility. Note the alchemic transformations that occur in the above prayer: vapor becomes liquid in the form of dew, an image that is highly appropriate for the water that that is received from the Holy Spirit. Bodily satisfaction becomes thirst, while spiritual thirst becomes spiritual satisfaction. In this manner spiritual perceptiveness allows the Christian to distinguish between true, spiritual satisfaction and the passing delights of the flesh.

---

[406] «Исполни Божественныя твоея любве душу мою, О Боже мой! Излей на мя пресвятую твою милость, ороси воду Пресвятаго твоего Духа, даждь ми воду пресвятыя твоея благодати, даждь ми воду сію Господи, да ктому не возжажду, ни прихожду къ тлѣнныя сея сладости кладязю, къ студенцу клятвенному Іаковлю: всякъ бо піяй от воды сея земныхъ сластей, возжаждется паки, а иже піетъ от воды твоея благодати, юже ты самъ даеши, не возжаждется во вѣки, но будетъ въ немъ источникъ воды текущія въ животъ вѣчный, яже есть Духъ Святый: да Божественныя твоея Благодатныя воды причастникъ бывъ, совершеннѣ насыщуся, внегда явитмися слава твоя»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 449. The Authorized (King James) Version of Ps. 17.15 reads: "I shall be satisfied when I awake, with thy likeness" (Ps. 17.15).

Transitions from one state to another are central to Dymytrii's rhetoric and the prayer's spiritual alchemy is reflected in the imperative command that is repeated under stanzas в and ѳ: "Again, without silence cry out to the Lord . . . " Like alchemy, spiritual mindfulness requires activity: if base metals remain unchanged, then the alchemist's work is of no value; and if the human soul remains unmoved, then the Christian has failed in his calling to become alchemist of his interior state. Dymytrii's emphasis on activity is reflected in the urgency of his instructions: he uses the imperative mood for the communicative action that precedes each stanza, thereby connecting spiritual perceptiveness with language. Language itself is dependent on the body's senses and is also the medium by which spiritual mindfulness finds expression in words of love and praise to God.

The Fifth Verse-Discourse: The Soul's Desirous Thanksgiving to God

Dymytrii's fifth and final poem of five-fold sensibility is entitled "The Fifth Poem, That of a most desirous thanksgiving to God for his gracious actions" (Стіхословія пятая: прежелательнаго къ Богу благодаренія о благодѣяніяхъ его). Unlike the second, third and fourth poems, which consist of ten verses each, the fifth poem consists of six stanzas only. Each of the six stanzas is preceded by an instruction to give thanks to the Lord and in each case a different reason to be thankful is given:

> (а) Give thanks to the Lord for he created you (Благодари Господа, яко сотворилъ тя есть);
>
> (в) Give thanks to the Lord because it was for your sake that all was brought from non-being into being (Благодари Господа, яко вся тебе ради от небытія въ бытіе привелъ есть);
>
> (г) Give thanks to Lord for he arranged all within you by means of right judgement (Благодари Господа, яко вся тебѣ праведнымъ судомъ устрои);
>
> (д) Give thanks to the Lord because it was for your sake that he came down to earth and took our human flesh upon himself (Благодари Господа, яко тебе ради на землю сниде, и взятъ плоть нашу на ся);
>
> (є) Give thanks to the Lord because it was for your sake that he suffered all evil (Благодари Господа, яко тебе ради вся злая претерпѣ);
>
> (ѕ) Give thanks to the Lord, for he at all times accepts you in your repentance (Благодари Господа, яко всегда кающагося тя пріемлетъ).

In Christian theology the idea of thankfulness is primarily associated with the Eucharist, indeed the word *eucharistos* in Greek means "to be grateful." The six stanzas that constitute Dymytrii's fifth poem not only conclude the Five-Sense Poems (and indeed the entire *Spiritual Alphabet* that precedes it), they also provide a Eucharistic prayer in which the nature of the human being's relationship to God is summarized and praise is given to God accordingly.

Observe the sequence presented in Dymytrii's six stanzas: (1) the creation of the human person; (2) the creation of the cosmos; (3) the good disposition of the inward person; (4) the incarnation of the Lord; (5) the passion and sacrifice of the Lord on the cross; (6) the repentance of the sinner. Dymytrii begins his poem of thanksgiving with the individual human person, not with the cosmos and not with God's sacrifice. He is here following his own principle that "it is proper to understand from a lower place things that are higher up.[407] Before any other knowledge may be acquired, self-knowledge must first be learned. In this Dymytrii is following the seventeenth-century understanding of the human being as a microcosmos of the universe.[408] He insists that only by first knowing themselves can men and women hope to approach the mysteries of the cosmos and of God's revelation.

Under the first stanza, "Give thanks to the Lord for he created you" Dymytrii reminds his readers of the spiritual purpose bestowed on all men and women at the moment of creation:

> I thank you my Lord, my giver of most abundant grace, for you created me in your image and likeness, you brought me from nonexistence into being and you crowned me with glory and honor. You did not create me a wild animal, or a beast, or some other animal, but a man, an understanding creature. You distinguished my soul with immortality and self-government. And if I should depart from this age of flesh, my immortal soul will exist not for a thousand years, nor for two or three thousand, but for all eternity without end. For just as a person is grateful and indebted to the physician who heals him from a certain illness, how much more so am I, O Lord, for you have created me whole, active, alive, healthy. For you brought me from nonexistence into being and you arranged me in all eternity without end.[409]

---

[407] «Не бо от горнихъ на нижняя восходити должни есмы, но от дольныхъ на вышняя»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 295.

[408] One well-known example of this microcosmology is John Donne's "Holy Sonnet V" with its references to "new lands" "new spheares" and "new seas" of the interior man. See John Donne, *The Divine Poems*, ed. Helen Gardner (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1952) 13.

[409] «Благодарю тебе Господа моего, благодателя прещедраго, яко сотворилъ мя еси по образу своему и по подобію, и от небытія въ бытіе привелъ мя еси, славою и честію вѣнчалъ еси. Не сотворилъ мя еси звѣремъ, ни скотомъ, ни инѣмъ коимъ животнымъ, но человѣкомъ, разумною тварію: безсмертіемъ и самовластіемъ душу мою почтилъ еси. Аще бо и разлучаемся временно плотію, но на лучшее преселеніе преходимъ, душею же безсмертнѣ пребываемъ во вѣки не на тысящу лѣтъ, ни на двѣ, или три тысящи, но во вѣки вѣчные конца неимущіе. Аще бо кто благодаренъ и виновенъ бываетъ врачемъ за малое точію нѣкое недуга врачеваніе, колико азъ паче, Господи, иже мя всего цѣла, дѣйственна, жива, здрава от небытія въ бытіе привелъ еси, и во вѣки безконечные устроилъ мя еси»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 453.

Stylistically, Dymytrii is repeating the very words that began his *Spiritual Alphabet.*[410] Rhetorically, he is following the Ciceronian model of disposition whereby the concluding section (*peroratio*) must include the enumeration of the main ideas that were presented during the course of the speech.[411] Dymytrii reaffirms that the starting point of spiritual wisdom lies within the human person, for it is founded on the free will and the understanding that adorn the immortal human soul. Heaven bestows life to men and women so that they may exercise freedom of will and actively seek wisdom. Correct choices and wise judgement are imperative if human beings are to acquire the wholeness and completeness of life that God intended for them.

Under the third stanza, "Give thanks to the Lord for he arranged all within you by means of right judgement," Dymytrii reminds his readers that the interior disposition of the human being is naturally inclined to goodness and understanding:

> I thank you my Lord, my giver of most abundant grace, for you arranged everything within me rightly and mercifully and you provide for my soul without ceasing. You defend me, preserve me, protect me and preserve my soul. You give me strength and health and you give me life. You give me understanding and you enlighten me. You teach and help me, guiding me and directing me towards all good deeds. You have arranged my inward self all-rightly and all-mercifully.[412]

Again, we see Dymytrii's *enumeratio* of the principal ideas introduced at the beginning of his *Alphabet*. The ordering of the human psyche is the most worthy of all rhetorical acts: good disposition and correct judgement are essential for spiritual life and the arrangement of the inward person is the most important act of rhetorical *dispositio*. Dymytrii reaffirms his belief in the natural goodness of the human being, for all men and women are the work of God's hand. A rhetorician, he sees the Divine arrangement of the inward person as a expression of God's merciful love and as a mark of the honor and dignity that is accorded to the human person.

---

[410] See chapter one.

[411] Cicero, *De inventione*, trans. H. M. Hubbell (London, 1949) 1.52.98 (= 149).

[412] «Благодарю тебе Господа моего, благодателя прещедраго, яко вся о мнѣ праведнѣ и милосерднѣ устроилъ еси, и непрестанно промышляеши о души моей: защищаеши мя, сохраняеши мя, покрываеши, заступаеши душу мою, даруеши ми крѣпость, здравіе, живиши мя, вразумляеши мя и просвѣщаеши, пособсвтуеши и помогаеши ми, руководствуеши и наставляеши мя на всякая дѣла благая: вся праведнѣ, милосерднѣ и благоутробнѣ о мнѣ устроилъ еси»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 453.

Honor and dignity, however, come with moral responsibility and the obligation to serve God in obedience. Dymytrii reminds his readers of this in the sixth stanza, entitled "Give thanks to the Lord, for he at all times accepts you in your repentance:"

> I thank you my Lord, my giver of most abundant grace, for you delivered me from the lies and the passions of this world and you have brought me into the fold of your sheep endowed with language. You have taken me into your service, you have made me your servant even though I am unworthy. You have abundantly multiplied your grace upon me, you have abundantly spread your grace upon me. You have covered me entirely, you have placed everything before my eyes and you have left nothing hidden from me.[413]

This stanza is the concluding word of the fifth poem and of the entire *Spiritual Alphabet*. Dymytrii's last words echo the theology of the four last things to be remembered: death, judgment, heaven and hell. Repentance and God's forgiveness are the final things that Christians must be mindful of. Rhetorically the *Spiritual Alphabet* follows a cyclical structure that reflects the life of repentance to which all believers are called. Men and women repent of their misdeeds only to stumble again, followed by further repentance.

---

[413] «Благодарю тебе Господа моего, благодателя прещедраго, яко исторгнулъ мя еси от молвъ и мятежъ міра сего, и привелъ мя еси во ограду словесныхъ овецъ твоихъ, и избралъ мя еси себѣ въ служеніе, служателя мене себѣ содѣлалъ еси, аще и недостоинъ есмъ. Обильно благодать твою надо мною умножилъ еси, обильно благодать твою надо мною простерлъ еси, удобенъ путь ко спасенію мнѣ показалъ еси. Вся мнѣ открылъ еси; Вся пред очи мои предложилъ еси, ничтоже от мене утаено оставилъ еси»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 455.

Dymytrii reminds his readers that they are God's sheep possessing a special gift, that of language. Human beings are unique among God's creatures, for they alone possess both bodies of flesh and the ability to produce intelligible speech. Language is spoken by God and the angels (including the fallen angels) but not by the inarticulate, fleshly beasts of the earth. Man is a unique creature, for his fleshly body contains a reasoning soul and with his reasoning and his understanding he is able to formulate meaningful utterances. It is language that marks human beings as having both a special dignity above all the creatures of the earth and a special moral obligation that accompanies this honor.

Dymytrii's final words, "You have covered me entirely, you have placed everything before my eyes and you have left nothing hidden from me," tie together the *Alphabet*'s themes of God's benevolence, man's spiritual sensibility and the completeness of wisdom that heaven has placed before the human being. *Memoria* is the art of mindfulness and just as the rhetorician must learn to improvise using his memory, so too must the soul learn to correctly perceive the world around it and to act accordingly by means of its spiritual mindfulness. *Memoria spiritualis* is a skill that requires perception, understanding and obedience to God's will. Just as rhetoricians must strengthen their powers of memory in order to adapt and survive the quickly changing circumstances of public oratory, so too must the soul cultivate spiritual mindfulness in order to live and flourish amidst the traps and dangers of the world. Both kinds of *memoria*—the practical memory of the rhetorician and the inward mindfulness of the soul—are dependent and at the mercy of the five senses. The five senses are the windows by which the soul perceives the world around it and through which the world leaves its impressions upon the soul. It is through the senses that men and women become mindful of God's presence and it is by means of *memoria spiritualis* that they can navigate the spiritual dangers that surround them.

Chapter Five: *Pronunciatio Spiritualis*

The fifth component of Classical rhetoric—*pronunciatio*—has its spiritual equivalent in the act of prayer. The rhetorical principles outlined in the *Spiritual Alphabet* bring order and harmony to the unruly soul and direct the human being toward a meaningful dialogue with God, based on mutual love and responsiveness. The *discipulus spiritualis* must learn the art of prayer to ensure that his supplications are delivered to heaven in a manner that is proper and good. *Pronunciatio spiritualis* is a dialogue through prayer that expresses the mutual respect and loving reciprocity governing the relationship between the human being and God. The sincerity and purity of prayer is reflected in the rhetorical ideals of simplicity, modesty and attentiveness that govern the art of this invisible, interior dialogue.

For rhetoricians the subject of *pronunciatio* deals primarily with voice quality and physical movement in regard to the delivery of an oration. The use of the voice and the body, however, was not simply a matter of learning theatrical gestures and voice projection—indeed Cicero denounced orators who employed techniques of delivery borrowed from the theatre. For Cicero rhetoric served the ethical and political purpose of moving society to correct behavior; it shared nothing in common with the theatre's world of illusion and false effects. At the same time, however, because rhetoric is concerned with reality and not imitation, the rhetorician must ensure that his delivery employs the tone of voice and gestures proper to the subject of his speech:

> And there can be no doubt that reality beats imitation in everything; and if reality unaided were sufficiently effective in presentation, we should have no need at all for art. But because emotion, which mostly has to be displayed or else counterfeited by action, is often so confused as to be obscured and almost smothered out of sight, we have to dispel the things that obscure it and take up its prominent and striking points. For nature has assigned to every emotion a particular look and tone of voice and

> bearing of its own; and the whole of a person's frame and every look on his face and utterance of his voice are like the strings of a harp and sound according as they are struck by each successive emotion.[414]

Cicero underlines the role that the emotions play in rhetorical pronunciation, "For delivery is wholly the concern of the feelings and these are mirrored by the face and expressed by the eyes, for this is the only part of the body capable of producing as many indicators and variations as there are emotions and there is nobody who can produce the same effect with the eyes shut."[415] Stefan Iavorsky's *Rhetorical Hand* associates *pronunciatio* (Slavonic: *proiznoshenie*) with the little finger, known in Slavonic as the ear-finger (*ushesnik*). The ear-finger of rhetoric—delivery—possesses the special property of clearing the ears of the listeners and enticing them to listen.[416]

In the task of spiritual understanding, prayer is the soul's equivalent of *pronunciatio*, or delivery, for it is the art of enticing God to listen, for as the Psalmist entreats, "Let my prayer come before thee: incline thine ear unto my cry" (Ps. 88.2). Just as the rhetorician uses the ear-finger of delivery to ensure that his speech is communicated properly, the spiritual rhetorician must learn the art of prayer to ensure that his supplications are delivered to heaven in a proper manner. Like *pronunciatio*, prayer is a dialogue based on mutual respect and reciprocity. As the soul's delivery, prayer is an essential player in the soul's work of leading the Christian from the outward knowledge of the world and directing him to the interior knowledge of the man's interior kingdom. Like all endeavors, the pursuit of light and knowledge is impossible unless men and women first commend themselves to prayer:

---

[414] Cicero, *De Oratore* 3.57.215–16 (2:171–72).

[415] Cicero, *De Oratore* 3.59.221 (2:177).

[416] «Мизинецъ или ушесникъ ушеса отираетъ и отверзаетъ ко слышанію»—Iavor'skyi 11.

> Do not commence anything, nor do anything, until you have united with God in prayer. Think on this: only correct understanding and good judgement together can make a man untouched and unafraid in all things. "Meditate in all things that you do," says the Lord to Joshua (Josh. 1.8).[417]

Dymytrii's *Alphabet* has profound spiritual implications for intellectual life since it integrally connects knowledge with prayer. For books and learning to flourish, it is first necessary that man's spiritual needs be attended to. Part one, chapter four of the *Alphabet*, entitled "On how it is that spiritual labor is a burden and a struggle as long as one does not enter into the enlightenment of the understanding"[418] begins by explaining the sources of outward and inward education and the role of prayer in spiritual understanding:

> In order to understand the outward, human things of this world, it is necessary to have outward, human education. Inner spiritual understanding does not come from human education. Instead it is necessary to seek Divine education from the Lord himself. For the first kind of understanding the *daskalia* of man is proper; for the second, that of God. Just as a man learns human wisdom from another man, so then it is proper that he learn divine wisdom from God. He who does not learn human things from a man, cannot, as it is proper, understand these human things. And so it is with one who does not learn God's things from God. It is by means of mindful activity and prayer and the loving kindness of tears that the soul learns the Divine understanding.[419]

---

[417] «Да не начинаеши, ниже что когда дѣеши, дондеже Богу молитвою соединяяйся, разсудиши: ничтоже бо сице во всѣхъ вещехъ непреткновенна и непоползновенна человѣка творити обыче, якоже правъ разумъ и разсужденіе. Да смыслиши о всѣхъ, яже аще дѣеши, рече ко Іисусу Навіну Господь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 308. The Authorized (King James) Version of Joshua 1:8 is "Thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest."

[418] «О еже дотолѣ въ дѣланіи духовномъ трудъ есть и подвигъ, дондеже не пріидетъ кто въ просвѣщеніе разума»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 303.

[419] «Внѣшній человѣческій міра сего разумъ, человѣческаго внѣшняго ученія требуетъ: духовныи же внутренній не человѣческаго, но Божественнаго ученія от самаго Господа да взыскуетъ. Ина даскалія человѣческая, ина же Божія. Якоже человѣкъ ученія человѣческаго от человѣка учится, сице и от Бога Божественнаго подобаетъ учитися. Не учивыйся кто от человѣка человѣческихъ, не можетъ, яко подобаетъ, разумѣти человѣческихъ, сице ни от Бога Божіихъ, чрез дѣланіе же умное, и чрез молитву и умиленіе слезное Божественнаго разума учится душа»—

Outward wisdom is learned from men, while inward wisdom proceeds from God. In this respect all learning shares a common nature with its source. Human—indeed humanist—education is the work of men, and it remains human in all its qualities: the flaws and imperfections of men are naturally present in this kind of learning. Divine education, by contrast, is the work of God and shares the Divine attributes of its source: truth and perfection are natural to this wisdom.

Dymytrii reminds his readers that they must understand the flawed and imperfect nature of the *ars humanitas* —the humanities— if they are to put this learning in its proper place. Dymytrii considers humanist education a sinful thing in the sense that that it is not perfect. Since the men who created the world's knowledge were sinners, what they created is a reflection of their own flawed and imperfect nature. For this reason, secular learning cannot be expected to impart inward wisdom to scholars. Humanist education can teach students about the world and about themselves; these things are necessary for a people to live, but they are not enough to acquire salvation. In order to acquire deeper wisdom, the mind must be cleansed and purified through prayer. Dymytrii emphasizes that if the mind is not continually cleansed through zealous prayer, it will not be a friend and companion to the soul, but a mortal enemy:

> As often as possible zealously raise your hands in prayer to God. Finding your help in this, you shall defeat the mind's Amalek, that is, the devil.[420]

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 303. Dymytrii uses the Grecism *daskalia* meaning "teaching, instruction" (GK *didaskalia*, derived from *didaskalos* i.e., "teacher"). The most well-known use of this term in scripture is St. Paul's "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith . . . or he that teacheth, on teaching (*didaskalia*)" (Rom. 12.6–7). In patristic literature the term is used to indicate both education in general and theological education in particular: the theological school of Alexandria, founded by Origen and Clement of Alexandria, bore the name *Didaskaleion*.

[420] «Руцѣ твои къ Богу наичастѣе въ молитвѣ воздѣвай усерднѣ, оттуду помощи всегда взыскуя, да побѣдиши мысленнаго амалика, сирѣчь, діавола»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

For this cleansing of the understanding three things are necessary: mindfulness, prayer and loving kindness ("It is by means of mindful activity and prayer and the loving kindness of tears that the soul learns the Divine understanding"). Unlike the material textbooks and exercises employed in schools, the slates and scribblers of the soul's education are invisible. Nonetheless, they are essential. Unless the student of the soul directs his mind to heaven through prayer and unless he sheds the tears of love, he will never acquire complete wisdom. He will become master of one wisdom only, that of the world and of his body. To know more than just this, he must turn to God's *daskalia*:

> For this reason, a man acquires knowledge of Divine things from God, just as he acquires knowledge of all things human by means of human learning. However, if he does not acquire knowledge of Divine things from God, he will understand little of these Divine things. He will know only the bodily things of man. The Holy Spirit is the source of all wisdom and understanding, if one receives him one will be able to understand and know all things interior and exterior.[421]

Important in the above is that the Holy Spirit is the source of all wisdom, both inward and outward. All skills—music, geometry, etc.—come from heaven. Here we may perceive a contradiction with Dymytrii's earlier assertion that the erudition of this world proceeds from men. But the erudite man is the physical product of his education. Though wisdom proceeds from the Holy Spirit, learned men and the things that they do cannot be anything but sinful. In this same respect, the Apostles received and became filled with the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, yet they remained sinful men:

---

[421] «Обаче же научивыйся кто от Бога Божественныхъ, возможетъ и кромѣ ученія человѣческаго разумѣти вся человѣческая; от Бога же не учивыйся Божественныхъ, ни мало можетъ разумѣти Божественныхъ, точію плотская человѣческая. Духъ Святый есть источникъ всякія премудрости и разума: получивый его кто, вся внутренняя и внѣшняя разумѣти и познати можетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 303.

> It was not from men that the apostles learned to speak in other languages, but it was by the descent of the Most Holy Spirit that they began to speak in many languages, as the Spirit had given them. And the Lord did not send his disciples to learn from a book, but rather, he opened their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures (Luke 24.45). For this reason it is only by zeal and zealous struggle that we receive and accept grace, everything, we receive accordingly and are able to have, only we must diligently struggle for this: all learning and every thing for which zeal is proper requires fervent diligence.[422]

Important to Dymytrii's understanding of prayer is the divine source of language. For Dymytrii grammar and rhetoric operate according to the same principles of order and agreement. When human beings speak, they practice the art of *dispositio* by arranging sounds into meaningful sentences. As God the Creator is the primordial rhetorician and master of arrangement, the act of language is a divinely ordered one. The dispositional nature of language and its ethical requirement are apparent in the Biblical narratives that serve as Dymytrii's inventive sources: the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost and its shadow narrative concerning the Tower of Babel. The Pentecost narrative concerns obedient submission to the Holy Spirit, the story of the Tower of Babel is about sinful pride. In the New Testament narrative obedience leads to meaningful utterance, while in the Old Testament story sin leads to linguistic chaos. Prayer is the most proper and the most dignified use of language, for it is done in the fullness of the Holy Spirit and is presented as a pure offering before God's throne.

---

[422] «Апостоли не от человѣкъ учишася инѣми глаглати языки, но нашествіемъ Пресвятаго Духа внезапу различными языки глаголаху, якоже Духъ даяше имъ. И Господь не книгу ученикомь въ наученіе разгну, но умъ отверзи имъ разумѣти писанія. Сего ради точію тщанія и подвига со тщаніемъ потреба есть, да пріимемъ и получимъ благодать [in 1741 edition of the *Alphabet*: да пріиметъ и получитъ благодать], вся, яже суть намъ ключимая, удобъ обрящемъ, и имѣти будемъ, точію да прилѣжно печемся: всяко бо ученіе и всяка вещь на тщаніи я на прилѣжаниіи усердномъ залежтъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 303–4. In the Authorized (King James) Version: Luke 24.45, "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures."

Thus, Dymytrii's art of prayer integrally connects to his understanding of language. It is important to remember the order in which understanding and language appear: first God must open a person's understanding, for only then can a meaningful utterance occur. The grammatical order of the individual and the scriptures is that of subject and object: "The Lord did not send his disciples to learn from a book, but rather, he opened their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures." The Bible does not give wisdom to man; it is God's wisdom given to man that enables him to know the scriptures. And at every step of the way, this task of spiritual understanding goes hand-in-hand with the task of spiritual delivery through prayer.

The Spiritual Struggle: Cooperation and Reciprocity between the Human Being and God

Although God's wisdom is a gift, it requires labor and diligence on the part of the recipient: "All learning and every thing for which zeal is proper requires fervent diligence." This idea of cooperation between man and God—synergy—is fundamental to Dymytrii's Christian ethics and highlights the importance of personal responsibility to the acquisition of knowledge. Significant also is the reciprocal nature of this relationship between responsibility and knowledge. Dymytrii explains that grace and knowledge are bestowed to Christians in proportion to the effort and struggle that they make in their personal lives. At the heart of this struggle and of this reciprocal relationship between the human being and God, is prayer.

This idea of reciprocity between effort and achievement is fundamental to pedagogical theory. According to Loyola, the child's efforts must be reinforced through reward and encouragement. As Dymytrii indicates, God's Spirit is the divine teacher of all things. And, as divine teacher, the Holy Spirit does not let man's efforts at spiritual learning go unrewarded. For Dymytrii, mastering the *Spiritual Alphabet* requires learning the various lessons and exercises God's Spirit has prepared for believers. Having fulfilled these tasks, they are promised the abundance of grace in proportion to their efforts:

> Outward learning is divided into various exercises and steps. In the same manner spiritual learning is divided into spiritual steps and exercises. After a measure of diligent struggle and exercise, enlightenment is given to the understanding. The Lord's grace is bestowed according to the measure of enlightenment of the understanding. To the degree that one struggles, then to the same degree one exercises the understanding, a man is enlightened and unites himself with the Lord. Having succeeded [in this] and having enlightened his soul and having united his understanding with the Lord, the individual's salvation is certain. Prior to the resurrection of his body, he will have the resurrection of his soul and he will live forever in the Lord.[423]

The fact that grace is bestowed to man in proportion to his spiritual struggles shows how Dymytrii's way of thinking is fundamentally that of a grammarian, rhetorician and educator. Loyola understood that motivation is crucial if children are to learn. Hence, rewards that children receive for fulfilling their lessons must be appropriate to the effort expended in achieving these goals. If they receive nothing, then they will cease to apply themselves to their studies. If rewards are too great or too small, then they will not apply themselves to the fullness of their ability. Likewise, Dymytrii reminds his reader that God has prepared various exercises to develop his spiritual knowledge. Upon fulfillment of these lessons, rewards await that will encourage him to apply himself further to the task of perfect understanding.

---

[423] «Якоже во внѣшнемъ ученіи суть различная преспѣянія и степени, сице и въ духовномъ духовная: и по мѣрѣ тщательнаго подвига и преспѣянія, подается просвѣщеніе разума: такожде и по мѣрѣ просвѣщенія разума, подается Господня благодать. Елико бо кто наипаче подвизается, толико и преспѣваетъ, толико и просвѣщается, толико и соединяется Господеви. Преуспѣвый же, и просвѣтивыйся душею, и соединивыйся разумомъ Господеви, спасенія своего извѣстенъ есть, и прежде воскресенія плоти воскресе душею, и живетъ всегда Господеви»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 304.

The first exercise that God has prepared for the *discipulus spiritualis* is humility:

> To the degree that one acts with understanding, then to a corresponding degree he recognizes his weakness. To the degree that one recognizes his weakness, then to a corresponding degree he is enlightened through understanding and he acquires humility and loving kindness. No one can recognize his own weakness, unless he, after a long period of time and with many temptations, fully acquaints himself with his inabilities and recognizes the very thing that he cannot have of himself.[424]

Again, proportion serves as the underlining principle in Dymytrii's rhetoric. When the human being concerns himself with the inward arrangement of his character—literally, his disposition—there develops a proportional relationship between his humility and understanding. The truly wise person is aware of his moral failings. The more wisdom he acquires, the more he understands his weaknesses.

But the proportional relationship between humility and understanding is a reciprocal one. On the one hand, wisdom leads to an awareness of one's own faults. On the other hand, the amount of humility that a man finds in his heart leads him to enlightenment and wisdom. And in turn, this wisdom leads him to complete humility and loving kindness.

---

[424] «По елику кто дѣлаетъ разумомъ, по толику познаваетъ свою немощь, и по елику познаваетъ свою немощь, по толику просвѣщается въ разумѣ, по толику и преуспѣваетъ во смиреніи и умиленіи. Не познаетъ же никтоже своея немощи, точію долгимъ временемъ, и многимъ искусствомъ, дондеже совершеннѣ отвсюду увѣсть свое неможеніе, и самою вещію познаетъ, яко ничтоже от себе иматъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 304–5.

Such principles of proportion, balance and reciprocity serve as a kind of alchemy for the human soul. Like grain being beaten on a thrashing-room floor, a man must be subjected to and broken by temptations if he is to grow spiritually. In Dymytrii's Christian philosophy, all things serve a higher purpose, including human transgression. Acknowledgement of one's weakness constitutes the path to self-understanding and humility:

> If one does not first acknowledge his weakness, as long as he is not thrashed and broken by the various temptations placed before him, as long as all these things have not been tested on him, then he will be unable to come to a complete understanding of himself and his weakness, he will not have humility.[425]

Note that Dymytrii refers to the *complete* understanding of the self. Those who have not been tempted and broken through sin and who have not acknowledged their weakness possess a self-understanding that is incomplete. In Dymytrii's sermons this impairment to one's self-perception leads to further misjudgment and transgression, in particular the sin of pride. The struggle with the self and with one's weaknesses is crucial if one is to have a complete and clear self-understanding rather than an incomplete, distorted one. Humility consists of the understanding of the self and of one's weaknesses. To this end, much labor and hardship is necessary. Dymytrii illustrates this with an agricultural metaphor:

> Grass, say flax or hemp, unless it is thrashed and torn with the wooden instruments that are made for these purposes, cannot be made into something useful, neither rope, nor thread, nor cloth, nor any thing to serve our needs. In the same way, unless the soul is shaken and softened by various temptations, it cannot come to a complete understanding of its weakness, it cannot know humility.

---

[425] «Не первѣе же кто познаетъ свою немощь, дондеже не будетъ сотренъ и сломленъ различными искушенія попущенми: и дондеже всѣхъ сихъ на себѣ не искуситъ, не можетъ совершенно пріити въ познаніе себе, и своея немощи, и быти смиренъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 305.

> To this end are needed many labors and struggles and constant activity of the mind, so that one can know his self and his weaknesses and forever be in humility.[426]

Dymytrii thus compares the untested soul with ordinary grass, and the broken and tempted soul with useful materials such as rope, thread and fabric. This idea that the human soul must be made into something useful, that is, it must be used for virtuous living and the working of good deeds, is fundamental to Dymytrii's ethics. Like a woman transforming flax and hemp into fabric, the *discipulus spiritualis* must seek to transform his soul into something that is of moral value. In effect, a spiritual alchemy must take place, where the base materials of human nature are transformed into the precious materials of human virtue:

> Having changed dumbness into knowledge and the enlightenment of understanding, rage and anger into meekness, the delights and appetites of the dumb flesh into Divine desire and love, you will then live in peace and rest, you will acquire joy and stillness always. You will then behold your soul threefold in the depths of passionlessness, immersed in the enlightenment of understanding. Like a timpani your mortified flesh will sing with spirit, rejoicing and singing to the Lord a song of victory.[427]

Christian living is understood as a spiritual alchemy bearing the fruits of knowledge, the enlightenment of understanding, meekness, Divine desire and love. In this respect, Dymytrii is following a kind of ethical poetics—poetics being the alchemy of the word—whereby meaning is evoked through a process of transfiguration. The base qualities of human existence—man's sinful desires, his anger and rage, his pride—are without meaning and constitute nothing but mute dumbness. Like the poet who gives life and meaning to dumb words, the spiritual learner must master the art of imbuing meaningfulness to the act of living though prayer:

---

[426] «Якоже быліе, глаголемое ленъ, или конопль, аще не будуть сотренна и сломленна въ древянныхъ на то учиненныхъ орудіяхъ, ничтоже содѣяти от нихъ кто можетъ, ни верви, ни нити, ни платна, ни инаго коеголибо дѣла въ требованіе: сице и душа не сотрена, и не умягчена различными искушенми, не возможетъ пріити въ совершенное своея немощи познаніе и смиреніе. Сія же вся многаго труда и подвига требуютъ, и умнаго всегдашняго дѣланія, дондеже кто познаетъ самаго себе и свою немощь, и пребудетъ всегда смиряяйся»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 306.

[427] «Премѣнивый безсловесіе на познаніе и просвѣщеніе разума, ярость и гнѣвъ претворивый на кротость, сласть и похоть плотскую безсловесную на Божественное желаніе и любовь, въ мирѣ и покои будеши, въ радости и тишинѣ всегда обрящешися. Тогда тричастное души во глубинѣ безстрастія, и просвѣщенія разума потоплено видѣвши, яко въ тѵмпанѣ бо умерщвленномъ тѣлеси воспоеши духомъ, радуяся, Господеви побѣдное воспѣвание»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 306.

This image of the Christian learner as alchemist-poet is crucial to following Dymytrii's ethics. The base element of life—the flesh—is not destroyed in the process, but transformed, just as the alchemist does not destroy matter but changes it into something else. And the poet's word's retain their physical integrity—i.e., their spoken sounds and the visual shapes of their letters—and yet they become transformed into something more precious: ideas, thoughts, images. The craftsman respects the physical material with which he works, he seeks not to destroy it, but to change it. And so Dymytrii calls his readers to become similar artisans of their lives, neither resigning themselves to their material existence, nor seeking to destroy it, but purifying it completely and becoming transformed in flesh, soul and spirit.

Here Dymytrii indicates that the work of the soul takes place on three levels. It is a three-part immersing of the soul in the depths of passionlessness in the enlightenment of the understanding bestows Christians with the gifts of peace and rest, joy and eternal serenity. Like the three-fold immersion in the sacrament of Baptism, the soul's work must attend to the vegetative, sensible and understanding faculties of the inward human being. In baptism there is a living person who receives the sacrament, there is the material of water that touches the flesh of the new Christian and there is understanding in the words of the priest.

Likewise, when Dymytrii speaks of the three-part ferment of the soul through the knowledge and enlightenment of the understanding and the cleansing of the passions, he is operating within the intellectual framework of a Christian neo-Platonist. Passion is connected to the sensible soul, enlightenment of the understanding to the rational soul. The always-present *zoe*—the vegetative soul—needs no mention, for she is present in all living things. The human soul, however, is unique in its balance of sensibility and reason. The animal kingdom is the kingdom of sensibility: speechless animals lack the reasoning soul of man. Conversely, the angelic world possesses reason without passionate sensibilities. The human being alone in God's creation possess all three souls—vegetative, sensible and rational. The human being alone is called to the three-fold immersion of his passions and reason in the light of God's wisdom and understanding.

Dymytrii's call to inward transfiguration, however, is not just a matter of theological speculation but a real and urgent task to which all men and women must attend. If they do not attend to this work, they will remain tormented by this world. Dymytrii's offers the following promise to those who seek the answer to Tobit's question ("What kind of joy will this be of mine, for I sit in darkness and am unable to see the light of the heavens?[428]):

> Until then, you cannot be without sorrow, until then you cannot be without pain, until then you cannot be without fear and trembling; as long as you have not come to know yourself completely, as long as you have not completely fermented your soul in three parts, through knowledge and the enlightenment of understanding and the cleansing of the passions; as long as you are not reconciled with God, as long as you do not unite with him in one spirit. When you unite with him and when you love him with all your heart, then you will be always without fear and pain: you will

---

[428] «Кая радость мнѣ будетъ, яко во тмѣ сѣжу, свѣта небеса не вижду»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 282.

> be as one spirit with God, always rejoicing and glad for the ages of ages.[429]

Like all endeavors, the task of divine ascent through prayer requires a work-space. The rhetorician's *pronunciatio* is delivered from church pulpits and in auditoriums; the rhetorician of the soul delivers his spiritual *pronunciatio* from a hidden, inward space: the human heart.

The Art of Prayer: the Inward Chamber of the Heart

Dymytrii's *Alphabet* constantly reminds his readers that the task of spiritual understanding must be accompanied by a zealous prayer life. To find true wisdom Christians must pray without ceasing, for this is the only means by which they may unite themselves with God:

> Apply yourself to prayer without ceasing, for this is a treasure that cannot be stolen; it is the ladder by which you ascend to God.[430]

On the subject of divine ladders, of course, Dymytrii doubtless recognized John Climacus as the leading authority. Indeed, as pointed out in chapter one of this thesis, Dymytrii's *Alphabet* does share certain rhetorical features in common with Climacus's *Ladder of Divine Ascent*. In his *Ladder*, Climacus outlined the four essential steps by which the human being raises himself to heaven:

---

[429] «Дотолѣ не можеши быти без скорби, дотолѣ не можеши быти без печали, дотолѣ не можеши быти без страха и боязни: донелѣ себе совершенно не познаеши, донелѣ совершенно не вскиснетъ тричастное душа, въ познанiи и просвѣщенiи разума, и очищенiи страстей, донелѣ съ Богомъ не примиренъ будеши, донелѣ съ нимъ во единъ духъ не соединишися. Егда же соединишися, и егда его всѣмъ сердцемъ возлюбиши, тогда без боязни и печали всегда будеши: о Бозѣ единомъ будеши духомъ всегда радуяся и веселяся во вѣки вѣчные»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 306–7.

[430] «Молитвѣ непрестанно прилѣжи, то бо есть некрадомое сокровище, еюже удобь, яко лѣствицею, къ Богу взыдеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

> The method by which he who wishes to raise himself off the earth and rise to heaven is as follows; first he must wrestle with his mind and tame his passions; second he must practise psalmody, that is, pray with the lips, for, when passions are subdued, prayer quite naturally brings sweetness and enjoyment even to the tongue and is accepted by God as pleasing to him; third, he must pray mentally; fourth, he must rise to contemplation.[431]

Climacus's "wrestling of the mind" and his "taming of the passions" share a certain resonance with Dymytrii's emphasis on the purification of man's understanding and his concern for virtuous living. Like Climacus, Dymytrii readily associates these two goals with prayer.

To understand fully Dymytrii's approach to prayer—the soul's *pronunciatio*—it is helpful to examine his treatise devoted entirely to this subject, entitled "The Inner Man in the Chamber of his Heart in Solitude Learns and Prays in Secret."[432] This treatise shares the same principle idea presented at the beginning of the *Spiritual Alphabet*: distinction between outward wisdom and inward wisdom. In the prayer treatise, "The Inner Man in the Chamber of his Heart" Dymytrii demonstrates the practical application of this neo-Platonic idea to the art of prayer, distinguishing between outward prayer and inward prayer. In this regard Dymytrii follows Erasmus's distinction between inward piety and outward piety in prayer life: "It is not a loud noise coming from the lips but the ardent desire of the mind that like some piercing sound strikes the ears of God."[433]

A rhetorician, Dymytrii knows (and was likely taught to do so at the Kyiv Collegium by his former teacher Ioanykii Galiatovsky) that the task of building any piece of writing always commences with the selection of a theme that will serve as a foundation for the entire work.[434] At the beginning of his prayer treatise Dymytrii selects a theme that underlines the human heart's role in man's zealous dialogue with God in prayer: "My heart burned within me, while I was learning the fire burned" (Ps. 38.4)[435]

---

[431] Cited in *Writings from the Philokalia on Prayer of the Heart* 159–160.

[432] «Внутренній человѣкъ въ клѣти сердца своего уединенъ поучающся и молящися втайнѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 144–55.

[433] From Erasmus's *The Handbook of the Christian Soldier*, quoted in Léon-E. Halkin 58.

In his foreword to the reader Dymytrii explains his reason for writing this work:

> Among us there are many who do not know "what is the inner man?" nor do they understand "what is divine meditation?" and they do not know how to pray prayers that are created in the mind and they hold that it is only proper to pray prayers that are written in ecclesiastical books. They are altogether ignorant of how to converse with God in the secret place of one's heart and are unaware of the benefits that come from this, and they have never tasted this spiritual sweetness and are like men born blind who have only heard about the shining of the sun, but do not really know what this shining is. Similarly there are many who who have at times heard about the knowledge acquired through divine meditation and prayer but do not understand how to do this and and remain ignorant of its many spiritual gifts and are bereft of the zeal of the good deeds that lead one to fullness in that which is pleasing to God. It is for this reason that follows here a certain little lesson concerning the inner man and his edification in the prayer of divine meditation. [This lesson] is for the sake of ordinary people. Let our self-edification now begin—if you please—bit by bit, hastening ourselves unto the Lord.[436]

---

[434] «Кто хочетъ казанье учынити, найперше маетъ положити зъ писма святого ѳему, которая есть фундаментомъ всего казаня»—Ioanykii Galiatovs'kyi 211.

[435] «Согрѣяся сердце мое во мнѣ, и въ поученіи моемъ разгорится огнь.» In the King James version: "My heart was hot within me, while I was musing the fire burned"—Ps. 38.4.

[436] «Понеже мнози суть въ насъ невѣдущіи, что есть внутреннее человѣка, ниже что есть Богомысленность, разумѣющіи, ни о творимой умомъ молитвѣ что знающій, но мнящіи, яко тѣми токмо молитвами подобаетъ молитися, яже написана суть въ церковныхъ книгахъ, а о тайномъ въ сердцы съ Богомъ бесѣдованіи и о происходящей оттуду пользѣ отнюдь незнающіи, ниже вкусившіи когда духовныя тоя сладости, и якоже слѣпорожденый о солнечномъ сіяніи токмо слышитъ, каково же есть сіяніе, того не вѣсть. Сице мыи о Богомысленномъ поученіи и молитвѣ развѣ слышатъ, разумѣти же не разумѣютъ, и лишаются невѣжествомъ своимъ многихъ благъ духовныхъ, и остаются преспѣянія добродѣтельнаго, на совершенное Богоугожденіе возводящаго: того ради предлагаются здѣ малая нѣкая ко внутреннему обученію, и къ Богомысленной молитвѣ

3

Dymytrii distinguishes two groups of people: those who are indifferent to prayer that is created in the mind, and those who know of such prayer but are opposed to it, arguing that the only prayer that is acceptable is that which is written in Church books. Dymytrii argues that books and rituals contain only outward knowledge. If this is all that one has, then one's faith is underdeveloped, for the gifts that accompany inner prayer are missing. These gifts are spiritual wisdom and obedience to God's commandments.

Here we see a hint of Dymytrii's life-long struggle with religious formalism, typified by the trial and tragic death of Silvestr Medvedev in Moscow in 1689 and later by his conflict with the Old Ritualists in Rostov. Like the Medvedev affair, the Old Ritualists' schism was based on a narrow focus on externals in religious matters, typical of Muscovite Orthodoxy at the time. Ever the kind pastor, Dymytrii holds that the source of their spiritual poverty is not due to some moral failing, but to simple ignorance, for "they are altogether ignorant of how to converse with God in the secret place of one's heart and are unaware of the benefits that come from this." Like Plato's cave-dwellers they have never seen the interior sunlight of the heart's prayer-chamber and consequently are blind to its existence.

This idea of spiritual blindness is central to Dymytrii's approach to religious dissenters, particularly the Old Ritualists. It is striking that the only dissenting religious group to which Dymytrii pays attention is the Old Believers. Islam, Roman Catholicism, Judaism—he is well-informed of these different faiths but devotes little attention to them in his writings. Even during the Medvedev affair his discussion of the transubstantiation was limited to the

---

наставленія простыхъ ради, да изволяяй начнетъ помалу наставлатися, Господу поспѣшествующу»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 144–45.

Orthodox, patristic teachings concerning this doctrine.[437] He understood the Roman Catholic teaching and he summarized it for his audience, but his defense consisted primarily in describing and explaining the Orthodox position. That throughout Dymytrii's written works he has little to say about non-Orthodox religious groups is explained by the fact that as a preacher and pastor his primary concern was for his own audience. The Orthodox preacher has no need to defend the Orthodox faith when his audience is made up exclusively of men and women who have already accepted the fullness of that faith. Under these circumstances other religious groups were simply not a part of the rhetorical situation in which Dymytrii spoke.

When dealing with Old Ritualists, however, Dymytrii's rhetorical situation was different and he adjusted his rhetoric accordingly. The one text that he wrote in response to the Old Ritualists' schism, *Examination of the Schismatic Brynian Faith*, is remarkable for the didactic, pastoral approach that he uses to defend the official Orthodox Church.[438] As a religious polemic this work is extraordinary for the patience, love and respect that the author demonstrates for his opponents: no hints of sarcasm, bitterness or irony can be detected anywhere in this text. Rather, Dymytrii adopts a pedagogical approach, believing that religious dissenters are like confused children. If they are simply helped to see the errors of their teaching, then their misunderstanding and error will be readily dispelled and they will rejoin the Orthodox Church. The *Examination* uses four steps to point out the errors of the Old Ritualists and to encourage them to return to the official Church: (1) the teachings that they have been taught are wrong; (2) the actions to which these incorrect teachings have directed them are wrong and sinful; (3) the faith to which they ascribe is not true; (4) these false teachings are harmful to their souls. Thus, for Dymytrii incorrect teaching and misunderstanding of all dissent and division in the church.

---

[437] See both the text of Dymytrii's defense and Grigorii Mirkovich's introductory essay in Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, "Razsuzhdenie o presushchestvlenii sviateishei evkharistii." See also my essay "East and West in the Theology of Dymytrij Tuptalo."

[438] See Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Rozysk o raskolnicheskoi brynskoi vere* (Kyiv, 1748).

For this reason Dymytrii begins his treatise on prayer by defending himself against those who are ignorant of inward prayer. Because these people do not understand interior prayer, they are opposed to it and deprive themselves of its benefits. In addition to this first group, Dymytrii also identifies a second group: those who know of its existence, but do not know how to apply themselves to divine meditation and prayer. A pedagogue, Dymytrii understands that these individuals need a methodology, or a practical lesson in how to achieve the goal of inward stillness and prayer. Therefore he adds "a certain little lesson concerning the inner man and his edification in the prayer of divine meditation . . . for the sake of ordinary people."

Dymytrii's lesson draws his readers' attention from the outward practices of religion and instead directs them to the inward source of faith: the human heart. Dymytrii's emphasis on the human heart fits squarely within the Eastern patristic tradition, particularly the belief that the center of human consciousness and of divine presence in man occurs not in the intellect or mind, but in the human heart. As Pseudo-Macarius explained:

> The heart is master and king of the whole bodily organism, and when grace takes possession of the pasture-land of the heart, it rules over all its members and all its thought; for it is in the heart that the mind dwells, and there dwell all the soul's thoughts; it finds all its goods in the heart. That is why grace penetrates all the members of the body.[439]

In Byzantine theology, particularly the hesychastic tradition of Gregory Palamas, the human heart was considered the dwelling place of God's Spirit, where the fullness of divine grace in man is manifested through an interior prayer life. As

---

[439] Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* 170.

Meyendorff explains, "the goal of prayer is not the disincarnation of the mind but a transfiguration of the entire person—soul and body—through the presence of the incarnate God, who is accessible to the conscious 'certitude of the heart'."[440] Thus it is not surprising that for Dymytrii the task of acquiring interior prayer begins by directing the spiritual learner to the invisible space of his own heart, where this kind of learning takes place.

Just as the rhetorician must begin each speech with a clear introduction that informs his listeners of what exactly to expect, a good instructor must begin each lesson by telling his students what they should expect to accomplish. The treatise demonstrates Dymytrii's approach to the planning of a spiritual lesson: (1) the lesson should be little; (2) it should concern the inner man and his edification in the prayer of divine meditation; (3) it should serve the needs of ordinary people; that is, everyone should benefit from it. Note also Dymytrii's pedagogical premise concerning the advancement of students: they will hasten, but they will do so "bit by bit." Small steps will take them where they want to go. Learning to pray, like all kinds of learning, requires that students continually push forward, but they must do so at a pace that is not discouraging. Big strides will tire them out and they will then fail to reach their destination.

Dymytrii's idea of the human heart as an interior chamber of wisdom carries resonance with the fascination of Early Modern writers and mystics with this particular part of the human anatomy. Teresa of Avila's *Castillo Interior* is the best known example of Baroque fascination with the human heart and the invisible chambers contained within.[441] Closer to Dymytrii's own cultural and geographic space and published in a language that he could perhaps understand, is John Comenius' *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart*. In his attempt to find wisdom in the world the book's narrator, identified as "The Pilgrim," is driven to despair. At that moment the voice of God is calls out, commanding him to enter into his heart.[442] The pilgrim observes that his heart is filled with broken things of the world—ladders, pulleys, ropes, plucked wings, clock-wheels, bent cylinders, teeth and rods—scattered in all directions. He finds that the wisdom he has learned in the world is useless in the task of understanding the purpose of these items and restoring them to working order.[443]

---

[440] Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* 170.
[441] See the English translation: Teresa of Avila, *The Interior Castle (The Mansions)*, trans. E. Allison Peers (London: Sheed and Ward, 1974).

Like Comenius, Dymytrii sees the inward chamber of the heart as a silent refuge from the clatter and distraction of the world. What is more, he believes that wisdom begins with the act of shutting oneself into this chamber in accordance with the scriptures:

> The spiritual education of the inner man begins with the following words of Christ: "When you pray, go into your chamber and having closed your door, pray to your Father in secret" (Matt. 6.6).[444]

---

[442] "The voice called a third time: 'Return to the place whence you came, to the home of your heart; and shut the door behind you!'

I obeyed this counsel as I understood it and I did exceedingly well to have thus obeyed God who was counselling me, but even that was his gift. Collecting my thoughts as well as I could and shutting my eyes, ears, mouth and nostrils and all other outward passages, I entered into the inner recesses of my heart and lo! it was dark"—Comenius, *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart* 103.

[443] "I wondered what the purpose of these various instruments was and how and by whom they had been damaged; and how they could be repaired. But looking and considering I could think of nothing; nevertheless, I began to hope that he who had led me into this chamber by his call—whoever he might be—would make himself heard again and direct me what else to do. For I began to be pleased with the beginnings of what I saw; the chamber did not have the offensive stench of those other places I had visited in the world, neither did I hear the nose and clatter, the din and crash, the disquiet and whirl, the tugging and violence, (of which the world was full) for all was quiet here"—Comenius, *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart* 103.

[444] «Внутренняго человѣка духовное обученіе начинается от словесъ Хрістовыхъ сихъ: Егда молишися, вниди въ клѣть твою, и затворивъ дверь твою, помолися Отцу твоему втайнѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 145. In he King James Bible: "But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret"—Matt. 6.6.

This connection between wisdom and the heart is reflected in the title of the first chapter: "On the two-fold nature of man, education, prayers and chambers"[445] In this chapter, Dymytrii reiterates the principal idea that connects this treatise to the *Spiritual Alphabet*, that it is necessary to discern between the outward knowledge of the world and the interior knowledge of the heart. He begins by reminding his readers of the two-fold nature of the human being:

> The nature of man is two-fold: outward and inward, fleshly and spiritual. The outward, fleshly nature is visible, the inward spiritual nature is invisible. Rather (according to the apostle Peter) "the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, of a meek and quiet spirit" (1 Peter 3.4). And St. Paul explains the two-fold nature of man, saying, "but though the outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed"(2 Cor. 4.16). The apostle clearly speaks of this outward and inward nature of man. The outward man is composed of numerous body parts; the inward man enters into completeness through his mind, his self-awareness, his fear of the Lord and Divine grace. The outer man is revealed through his deeds. The actions of the spirit, however, are invisible: according to the Psalmist, "A man approaches and his heart is deep" (Ps. 64.6). And the apostle says, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" (1 Cor. 2.11)—this alone can test the heart and man's innermost part and know all the secrets of the inward person. [446]

---

[445] «О сугубствѣ человѣка, обученія, молитвы и клѣти»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 145.

[446] «Сугубъ есть человѣкъ, внѣшній и внутренній, плотянъ и духовенъ. Внѣшній, плотяный видимый есть, внутренній же духовный невидимый. Но (по словеси святаго апостола Петра) потаенный сердца человѣкъ въ неистлѣній кроткаго и молчаливаго духа. И Павел святый сугубство человѣческое изявляеть, глаголя: Аще внѣшній нашъ человѣкъ и тлѣеть, но внутренній обновляется. Се внѣшняго и внутренняго человѣка быти явѣ сказуеть апостолъ. Внѣшній убо человѣкъ от многихъ членовъ составляется: внутренній же умомъ, вниманіемъ себѣ, страхомъ Господнимъ, и благодатію Божіею въ совершенство приходить. Внѣшняго человѣка дѣла явѣ бываютъ: внутренняго же человѣка недовѣдома суть, по Ѱаломнику: приступить человѣкъ, и сердце глубоко. И апостолъ глаголеть: Кто вѣсть от человѣкъ, яже суть въ человѣцѣ, точію духъ человѣка живущій въ немъ: Единъ токмо испытуяй сердца и утробы вѣсть вся тайны внутренняго человѣка»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 145–46. The Slavonic text of Ps. 64.6–7 reads «приступить человѣкъ, и сердце глубоко, и вънесется Богъ стрѣлы младенецъ бышя язвыхъ» (A man approaches, his heart is deep,and God raises up arrows and they are wounded); in the King James Bible, "[They search out iniquities; they accomplish a diligent search: both the inward thought of every one of them]

Of particular significance is Dymytrii's presentation of the human being's mind, self-awareness and fear of the Lord as bodily parts of the spirit that brings him into the completeness of Divine Grace. Just as the body uses its hands, feet and other members to accomplish the tasks of the flesh, man's spirit utilizes his mind, his self-knowledge and his fear and knowledge of the Lord to accomplish all the invisible tasks of the spirit.

This two-fold, visible and invisible nature of the human being, of course, is mirrored by the two different kinds of wisdom and the two different kinds of education that are accorded to these different kinds of wisdom:

> And education is of a two-fold nature: outward education in books, inward education in divine meditation; outward education in philosophy, inward education in the love of God; outward education in eloquence, inward education in prayer; outward education in the acumen of the mind, inward education in the warmness of the spirit; outward education in artistry, inward education in meditation; outward knowledge puffs one up (1 Cor. 8.1), inward wisdom makes one humble; outward knowledge inquires diligently, attempting to understand all things; inward knowledge reflects upon itself and desires to know nothing, only God. In the Psalms of David is thus said to him: "[when thou saidst] Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek" (Ps. 27.8). And again: "As the deer long for the water streams, so longs my soul for you, O God" (Ps. 42.1).[447]

---

and the heart is deep. But God shall shoot at them with an arrow; suddenly they shall be wounded."

[447] «Сугубое и обученіе есть: внѣшнее и внутреннее: внѣшнее въ книгахъ, внутреннее въ Богомышленіи: внѣшнее въ любомудріи, внутреннее въ Боголюбіи: внѣшнее въ витіиствованіяхъ, внутреннее въ моленіяхъ: внѣшнее въ остроуміи, внутреннее въ теплотѣ духа: внѣшнее въ художествахъ, внутреннее въ помышленіяхъ: внѣшній разумъ кичитъ, внутренній же въ смиряется: внѣшній любопытствуетъ хотя вѣдати вся, внутренній же себѣ внимаетъ и ничтоже ино желаетъ вѣдати кромѣ Бога. Давидски къ нему глаголя: Тебѣ рече сердце мое: Господа взыщу, взыска тебе лице мое, лица твоего Господи взыщу. И паки: Имже образомъ желаетъ еленъ на источники водныя: сице желаетъ душа моя къ тебѣ Боже»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 146. The King James text of Ps. 27.28, with its second person singular and plural is easier to follow than any contemporary English translation. The King James text of Ps. 42.1 reads, "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God."

As in the first part of the *Spiritual Alphabet* Dymytrii is not arguing against education and learning.[448] What he is arguing against is the intellectualizing of faith and a failure to temper erudition with humility, selflessness, good deeds and charity. Education in itself is not evil, but without the tempering of the spirit, the sharpening of the mind makes a man proud and vain.

The two-fold nature of wisdom and Dymytrii's conviction that inward, invisible understanding is just as important as the outward understanding of the world, leads to the two-fold nature of prayer :

> And prayer is two-fold: outward and inward: that which is done visibly and that which is done in secret; that which is done communally and that which is done in solitude; that which is obligatory and that which is voluntary. Communal prayer—nocturne, matins, the hours, liturgy, vespers, compline—is done visibly and is obligatory according to church law. It has its accorded time when the bells call people to prayer. Communal prayer is obligatory, for it is proper to give this offering unto the heavenly king each day.[449]

Dymytrii's distinction between outward prayer and inward prayer also bears a certain resonance with Climacus's *Ladder*, in which distinctions are drawn between psalmody, mental prayer and contemplation. For Dymytrii, outward prayer—worship—is easily identified according to its communal, visible, audible, temporal (i.e., it occurs at an appointed time) and obligatory nature. Notably, it shares all these features in common with the outward learning of the school classroom. Rhetorically, outward prayer is a model of good arrangement, or *dispositio*, for communal worship is highly structured and divided into liturgical services consisting of appointed litanies, prayers, psalms and hymns. In contrast, inward prayer is of a completely different nature:

---

[448] See chapter one.

[449] «Сугубая и молитва, внѣшняя и внутренняя: явѣ творимая, и въ тайнѣ: соборная, и наединѣ бываемая: должная, и произвольная. Творимая явѣ, по уставу церковному должная, соборная молитва имать своя времена: полунощіе, утреню, часы, літургію, вечерню, повечеріе, на которая моленія и звономъ призываются людіе: должни бо та, яко подобающую дань Царю небесному на всякъ день воздавати»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 146–47.

> Done in secret, the voluntary prayer takes place not at an appointed time, but when a person desires it. There is nothing that calls a person to this prayer, only the spirit that rises up within. Ecclesiastical prayer has its number of appointed psalms, troparions, canons and various hymns and priestly actions. Secret and voluntary prayer, just as it is without appointed time, has no such number [of psalms, troparions, etc.] that orders it, for it is prayed as one desires it—sometimes briefly, sometimes longer. For [communal prayer] is pronounced with the mouth and its sound is audible; [secret prayer] is done only with the mind. One is done standing; the other is done not only when standing or walking, but also sitting and when resting on one's bed, whensoever one happens to raise one's mind up to God. Communal prayer is done in the Lord's temple, in church, or, if it so happens, in some sort of house, in which it is possible for certain people to gather. Solitary prayer is made complete in one's closed chamber, according to the Lord's words: "When you pray, go into your chamber and having closed your door, pray to your Father in secret."[450]

Thus, the inward prayer of the heart possesses a nature that is personal, invisible, inaudible, nontemporal (i.e., it is not governed by time), not governed by space and circumstances, and voluntary. Rhetorically inward prayer possesses a freedom that transcends the highly organized *dispositio* of outward prayer. Thus, rhetorically, invisible prayer shares more in common with *memoria*, for just as memory is the requisite mindful state that enables the rhetorician to improvise and to speak *impromptu*, inward prayer is a state of mindfulness whereby one's thoughts are continually raised up to God. In terms of *pronunciatio*, inward prayer also demonstrates great freedom of outward delivery, for it may be done in any outward location and using any body position. At the same time, however, it is highly restricted with regard to inward delivery, for it can be done in one location only—the invisible chamber of the human heart.

---

[450] «Творимая же втайнѣ, произвольная молитва бываетъ и безвременно, когда кто восхощетъ, никомже зовущу, токмо самому подвижущу духу. Оная церковная молитва имать число положенныхъ ѱалмовъ, тропарей, и канноновъ, и прочихъ пѣній й дѣйствъ іерейскихъ: сія же (тайная и произвольная) якоже безвременна, сице и числомъ неопредѣляема есть, елико бо кто хощетъ, молится, овогда кратко, овогда продолженнѣ. Оная устнами и гласомъ вслухъ глаголется, сія же умомъ токмо. Оная стоя дѣется, сія же не токмо стоя или ходя, но и сѣдя и на одрѣ почивая, якоже когда случится возвести умъ свой къ Богу. Оная соборная творится въ храмѣ Господенъ, въ церквѣ, или по случаю въ коемъ домѣ, а може на то нѣцыи соберутся: сія же уединенная совершается въ затворенной о себѣ клѣти, по словеси Господню: Егда молишися, вниди въ клѣть твою, и затворивъ дверь твою, помолися Отцу твоему втайнѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 147.

Next, concerning chambers, Dymytrii's explains:

> And the chamber is two-fold, outward and inward; material, I say and spiritual. The material chamber is made of wood or stone, while the spiritual chamber is the heart, or the mind, or (according to St. Theophylact) the mystic thought. All these are the same thing. The material chamber stands in one place, while the spiritual chamber is carried everywhere by the person. Wheresoever a man is, there is at all times the interior of his heart (Matt. 6.16), within which his mind and his collected thoughts are to be secluded, to pray secretly to God, even when he is among other people and conversing with many men. For the inward prayer (cannot one achieve this in the spirit even in the midst of other people?) has no need of lips, nor does it seek books, nor does it require the movement of the tongue, nor the throaty voice (for it comes to one in solitude); rather, it only requires the directing of the mind toward God and the absorption of oneself in him. Thus, it can be performed in every location.[451]

Important is Dymytrii's idea of interior solitude. The title of his treatise, "The inner man in the chamber of his heart in solitude learns and prays in secret," does not refer to outward solitude of a physical chamber but to the inward solitude of the heart. In this passage and in those that immediately follow, Dymytrii speaks of an inner stillness that allows people to function *within* society. He explains that it is inner quiet and solitude that are necessary, not the outward seclusion of the monastic cell. It is not the shutting out of the world that brings spiritual wisdom, but the stillness of the heart.

---

[451] «Сугубая и клѣть есть, внѣшняя и внутренняя: вещественная, глаголю, и духовная: вещественная от древа или камене, духовная же клѣть сердце, или умъ, или (по святому Ѳеофѵлакту) мысль тайная. Все же то едино есть. Оная убо вещественная клѣть на единомъ стоитъ мѣстѣ, сія же всюду съ человѣкомъ обносится, гдѣ лико человѣкъ есть, всегда внутрь его сердце его, въ немже можетъ умомъ своимъ, помышленія своя собравъ затворитися, и молитися втайнѣ къ Богу, аще и посредѣ людей сущи, и со многими бесѣдующи: внутренняя бо молитва (случится ли кому посредѣ людей сущу къ ней подвигнутися духомъ) ни устенъ требуетъ, ни книги ищетъ, ни движанія языка употребляетъ, ни гортаннаго гласа (аще и въ то на уединеніи происходитъ) но самаго точію возведенія ума къ Богу и углубленія въ онь, еже на всякомъ мѣстѣ дѣлати возможно»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 147.

In the context of inward prayer, Dymytrii identifies the heart and the mind as the same thing ("the spiritual chamber is the heart, or the mind"). Furthermore, Dymytrii adds that the invisible chamber of the heart/mind is the same thing that St. Theophylact identifies as the "mystical thought." Here, the question arises whether or not Dymytrii is adhering to the notion of the spirit as the reasoning element of the human soul, in accordance with St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.

This discrepancy between spirit and mind is addressed elsewhere in Dymytrii's treatise. In the chapter entitled "How prayer that is spoken with lips, but not attended to in the mind, is nothing,"[452] Dymytrii draws our attention to the discrepancies between St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians and his Epistle to the Corinthians:

> In his Epistle to the Ephesians, the holy apostle Paul advises us to pray with the spirit: "praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit" (Eph. 6.18). That same apostle says in his Epistle to the Corinthians: "my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful" (1 Cor. 14.14). How can this be, that a man prays in the spirit but his understanding remains fruitless?[453]

---

[452] «Яко молитва устнами глаголемая, умомъ невнимаемая, ничтоже есть»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 150.

[453] «Въ посланіи къ Ефесеомъ святый апостолъ Паѵелъ совѣтуетъ молитися духомъ: Всякою (рече) молитвою и моленіемъ молящеся на всякое время духомъ. Тойже апостолъ въ посланіи къ Корінѳяномъ глаголетъ: Духъ мой молится, а умъ мой безплода есть: како убо то бываетъ, яко молящуся человѣку духомъ, а умъ остаеть безплоденъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 150–51.

As a philologist, Dymytrii seeks to explain Paul's words in the knowledge of sacred philology:

> Response: This word "spirit" is understood in numerous ways according to the Holy Scriptures. Sometimes it is understood to mean "breath"; sometimes it refers to the soul itself; sometimes it refers to a desire or intention, either good or evil; and [sometimes] it refers to some inner virtue or a vice, such as the following: "spirit of humility" or "spirit of love" or "spirit of mercy" and so on. And the opposite: "spirit of pride" or "spirit of anger" or "spirit of avarice" and so on. Sometimes "spirit" refers to a gift of the Holy Spirit, such as "spirit of wisdom" or "spirit of understanding" or "spirit of perspicacity" and so on. Sometimes it is understood to mean the mind itself, for this same apostle writes: "And be renewed in the spirit of your mind" (Eph. 4.23).[454]

Like a lexicographer, Dymytrii supplies the requisite definitions, gives examples for each and then documents his source. Philological study, however, is only the first step. The next step is to interpret:

> When the apostle advises the Ephesians to pray in the spirit, it is understood that here "spirit" refers to the mind itself. The praying man should direct it [the mind] towards God. When St. Paul writes, saying that one prays in the spirit but the understanding remains unfruitful, it is here understood that "spirit" refers to man's breath and voice.[455]

---

[454] «Отвѣть: То реченіе, духъ от святаго писанія различнѣ разумѣется въ человѣцѣ: овогда бо полагается вмѣсто дыханія, овогда вмѣсто самыя души, овогда вмѣсто каковаго желанія и намѣренія добраго или злаго, и вмѣсто внутреннія коея добродѣтели, или недобродѣтели, якоже сіе: духъ смиренія, духъ любве, духъ милосердія, и прочая. И сопротивно: духъ гордини, духъ ненависти, духъ сребролюбія, и прочая. Овогда полагается духъ вмѣсто коего дарованія Духа Святаго, якоже духъ премудрости, духъ разума, духъ прозорливства, и прочая. Овогда же емлется вмѣсто самаго ума, якоже въ томже апостолѣ пишется: обновляйтеся, рече, духомъ ума вашего»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 151.

[455] «Егда убо совѣтуетъ апостоль Ефесяномъ да молятся духомъ: полагаетъ тамо духа вмѣсто самаго ума, егоже моляйся человѣкъ вперити въ Бога. Егда убо и Корінѳяномъ пишя сказуетъ духа молящася, умъ же безплода пребывающа, полагаетъ на мѣстѣ духа вмѣсто дыханія человѣческаго и гласа»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 151. The original text contains a typesetting error that renders the last sentence meaningless: «Егда убо и Корінѳяномъ пишя сказуетъ духа молящася, ума же безплода пребывающа, полагаетъ на мѣстѣ умъ духа вмѣсто дыханія человѣческаго и гласа.»

In connection with the passage concerning St. Theophylact, Dymytrii is likely approaching the mind-spirit relationship within the context of that author's exegesis concerning Matt. 6.6. The original text of Theophylact is as follows:

> Explanation: When one is not praying in church but (the more so and very exceedingly) when one, in the correct state of mind, is praying not in the presence of men (given that the location does not spoil this), thought, understanding and action (for the sake of human weakness) create a chamber—that is, a mystic thought.[456]

Thus for St. Theophylact the mystic thought consists of three ingredients: thought, understanding and actio, all three being dependent upon the reason. For Dymytrii the chamber of the heart is the place where the mind collects its thoughts in order to be secluded and to pray secretly to God. Thus inward prayer occurs in the heart, but it proceeds from the rational element of the soul—the mind. Dymytrii makes it clear that inward prayer has no need of flesh, nor does it require the study of books: rather, it requires only the directing of the mind toward God and the absorption of oneself in Divine presence. As Dymytrii explains:

> In a man's material chamber he can withdraw into silence. In a man's spiritual chamber he carries within himself God and all the heavenly kingdom, for thus did Christ himself say in the Gospels: "The kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17.21). In the words of St. Macarius of Egypt this is explained thus: the heart is a small container, but within it are found all things: therein is God, therein are the angels, therein is life and the kingdom, therein are the heavenly cities, therein is the depository of grace.[457]

---

[456] «Толкованіе: Что убо, еда ли въ церкви непомолюся, паче и зѣло но правою мыслію, яко не являтися человѣкомъ, понеже бо мѣсто неповреждаетъ, но мыслъ, и разумъ, и дѣло, мнози бо втайнѣ молящеся, на человѣкоугодіе сіе творятъ клѣть же, мысль тайная есть»—Theophylact *Tolkovanie na Evangeliie [Blagovestnik]* (Moscow, 1649) fol. 28.

[457] «Вещественная клѣть единаго человѣка въ ней безмолвствующаго затворяетъ, внутренняя же духовная вмѣщаетъ въ себѣ Бога и все небесное царство, самому Хрісту во еѵангеліи глаголющу: Царство Божіе внутрь васъ есть. Еже въ словесахъ святаго Макаріа Егѵпетскаго изясняется сихъ: Сердце сосудъ малъ есть, но въ немъ вмѣщаемы бываютъ вся вещи, тамо

Hence, all the outward wisdom of books and of the world is superfluous to the heart's wisdom. Dymytrii reminds his reader that the truly wise man, rather than absorbing himself in books, will instead seek the unwritten wisdom that is inscribed upon the invisible chamber of his heart:

> It is within the inward chamber of the heart that it is more important for a man to frequently seclude himself, more so than within the confinement of walls. Collecting all his thoughts and placing his mind before God and in secret praying to him, with the warmth of his spirit and his living faith together learning in divine meditation he can then flourish into a complete man.[458]

Those who shun interior silence will not flourish as complete human beings, for it is in the heart where mind, spirit and faith are collected and pressed together to yield the fruits of divine meditation. Elsewhere, in his Sermon on the Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost, Dymytrii uses the winepress from the parable of the vineyard (Matt. 21.33–44) to symbolize the human heart's work as the wine-press of the soul that presses with loving kindness (Slavonic: *umilenie*).[459]

Love is indeed the force that moves the spiritual winepress of the heart. The second chapter of Dymytrii's "The Inner Man in the Chamber of his Heart" is entitled "On prayer that inspires a man to unite with God in love."[460] The purpose of prayer is to unite with God, a union which cannot take place unless men and women desire it with the purest and most sincere love:

Богъ, тамо аггели, тамо животъ и царство, тамо небесныи градове, тамо сокровища благодати»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 147.

[458] «Въ той убо внутреннѣй сердечной клѣти паче, неже между стѣнами затворятися часто»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 147.

[459] «Бо особности же, віноградомъ есть всякая душа Хрістіанская правовѣрнаго и благочестиваго человѣка: оплотъ, страхъ Божіи: точило, сердце, точащее умиленіе: столпъ, крестъ, всегдашнее памятствованіе страданія Хрістова: дѣлатели, душевныя силы, память, разумъ и воля: рабы, чувства: наслѣдник же того вінограда и тойже Хрістосъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 2: 434.

[460] «О молитвѣ, согрѣвающей человѣка и въ любовь съ Богомъ соединяющей»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 148.

> Union with God cannot be achieved with anything but extremely sincere love. It was for this reason that the sinful woman of the Gospels received from him a great mercy for the remission of sins and a firm union with him, for she loved much (Luke 7.47). He loves those who love him (Prov. 8.17) and those who bind themselves unto him are bound and those that seek him shall find him and those who desire his love shall receive his abundant sweetness.[461]

However, even if a man's heart is sincerely moved by Divine love and even if he possesses a sincere and warm desire to unite with God, this is not enough. Discipline must be applied to the seeking of this union and to this effect the Chistian must apply himself to the act of prayer as frequently as possible:

> Thus, for a man to enable himself to stir up within his heart the Divine love, through which he unites himself unto God and binds himself unto him with an unbreakable union, it is necessary to pray frequently, directing his mind to God. Just as wood that is frequently cast [on the fire] multiplies the flames, in the same manner, prayer with the frequent immersion of the mind in God, stirs up the heart to Divine love and becomes a flame. All the inward man burns and is enlightened and acquires knowledge and the ineffable and secret wisdom is revealed to him and he becomes like a flaming seraph, at all times standing before God in his spirit and gazing at him with his mind and partaking of the spiritual sweetness.[462]

---

[461] «Соединитися же съ нимъ не инымъ чимъ кто сице можетъ, якоже крайнею сердечною любовію. Ибо и Еvангельская грѣшная жена сего ради получи у него велію грѣхопростительную милость, и крѣпкое съ нимъ соединеніе, яко возлюби много. Онъ бо любящыя его любитъ, и прилѣпляющымся ему прилѣпляется, и ищущымъ его себе представляетъ, и желающымъ насладитися любве его неоскудно подаетъ сладость»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 149.

[462] «Да возможетъ же человѣкъ таковую въ сердцѣ своемъ возбудити Божественную любовь, еюже бы ему съ Богомъ соединитися, и связатися неразлучнымъ любве союзомъ, требѣ часто молитися, возводящи умъ свой къ Богу, якоже бо дрова огню часто прилагаемыя умножаютъ пламень, сице молитва, со углубленіемъ въ Бозѣ ума часто творимая возбуждаетъ въ сердцѣ любовь Божественную, яже егда воспламенится, всего внутренняго человѣка согрѣетъ, и просвѣтитъ, и научитъ, безвѣстная и тайная премудрости своея явитъ ему, и сотровитъ его, аки пламенноогнена серафіма, выну Богу предстояща духомъ, и умомъ нанъ взирающа, и оттуду духовную почерпающа сладость»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 149–50.

Thus, just like children must immerse themselves in their lessons, drills and exercises, so too must the human heart be exercised in the task of prayer ceaselessly and diligently. Just as frequent practice enables children to acquire the outward skills and knowledge that is the purpose of their education, frequent prayer enables the inward person to burn with the ineffable and secret wisdom of heaven and to unite with God in spirit and in mind.

Dymytrii emphasizes this point in his final chapter of the treatise, entitled "How prayer that is short and frequently done is more beneficial than that which is more drawn out."[463] Not only must prayer be as frequent as possible, it should also be as short and simple as possible:

> Learn from those who are skillful in Divine meditation and in the prayer of the heart that is created in the mind: short and frequent [prayer] is warmer and more beneficial than that which is prolonged. (However, prolonged prayer is not without benefit, but this is only for those who are experienced, not for those who are novices) During prolonged prayer, the mind (but not for the man that is accustomed to this) cannot stand before God for an extended period, for usually inconstancy prevails due to fatigue and one becomes distracted by outward things and the warmth of the spirit quickly grows cold. Such a prayer is not prayer, but a confusion of the mind with thoughts and the things that come of them. This happens in the communal singing in church and in the many observances done in private. Short and frequent prayer is more constant, for then the mind immerses itself in God for a short period, warmly enabling it to fulfill itself.[464]

---

[463] «Яко краткая, часто же творимая молитва, полезнѣйша есть паче продолженныя»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 152.

[464] «Увѣдася от искусныхъ въ Богомысліи и о творимое умомъ от сердца молитвѣ, яко теплѣйша и полезнѣйша бываетъ та, яже вкрацѣ, часто же дѣется паче продолженной: (аще и продолженная не без многія пользы бываетъ, но то въ совершенныхъ:) въ продолженной бо молитвѣ умъ (не у обыкшаго въ томъ человѣка) не можетъ долго предстоати Богу, но обычною непостоянства немощію побѣждаяся, восхищается ко внѣшнимъ, и теплота духа вскорѣ въ немъ устудѣваетъ, и бываетъ таковая молитва не молитва, но ума смущеніе помышленіямъ сѣмо и овами того влекущымъ, еже дѣется и въ церковныхъ соборныхъ пѣніяхъ, и въ келейныхъ многочтомыхъ правилахъ: краткая же а частная молитва постоятельнѣе, всему бо уму на малъ часъ углубившуся въ Бозѣ, теплѣе совершатися можетъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 152–53.

Dymytrii's advice on prayer is comparable to the way we teach children, or any other learner. Short, frequent and easily mastered exercises are most beneficial. Too difficult an exercise will tire the unaccustomed mind. Dymytrii also distinguishes between those who are experienced in the art of prayer and those who are novices. Like any other learning task, the learning of prayer must be carried out in accordance with the student's own level of ability. To those who are advanced, prolonged prayer is indeed possible. But, Dymytrii is writing his treatise for readers who are not yet advanced but wish to learn; therefore, he recommends that they make short prayers and make them as frequently as possible.

As a spiritual pedagogue Dymytrii is mindful of the importance of sources. If believers wish to learn about prayer, they should seek the expertise of those who are masters in this art. For, as any educator knows, the students will model themselves according to the example of their teacher. To this end, Dymytrii enlists the help of St. John Climacus:

> For this reason the Lord said: "When you pray, do not speak vainly, for you shall not be heard for your many utterances" (Matt. 6.7). And St. John Climacus teaches: Do not start making manyfold utterances—so that your mind does rush out in all directions with the making words. It was by one word that the publican received mercy, it was one word that saved the faithful thief. Abundant wordiness causes the mind to be preoccupied with many things spilling out. A single word allows the mind to collect itself. It is thus according to Climacus.[465]

---

[465] «Чесо ради и Господь рече: Молящеся не лишше глаголите: не бо многоглаголаніи бо услышаны будете. И святый Іоаннъ Лѣствичникъ поучаетъ: Не многословити начинай, да не ко взысканію словесъ разыдется умъ. Едино слово мытарево Бога умилостиви, и единъ глаголъ вѣренъ разбойника спасе: многословіе убо многажды въ молитвѣ умъ возмечта и разлія, единословіе же множицею умъ собрати возможе. До здѣ Лѣствичникъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 153. Dymytrii cites St. John Climacus, "Discourse on Prayer, Number 28." The King James translation of Matt. 6.7 reads: "But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking."

Dymytrii clearly disapproves of those who associate piety with the length of their prayers and devotions (no doubt he is referring to the conservative element of Moscow's Orthodox clergy).[466] To emphasize his point, Dymytrii employs the teachings of Church Fathers, such as Theophylact, who recommend modesty and restraint in the art of prayer:

Dymytrii's emphasis on economy of prayer—on the modesty and restraint that one should exercise in one's supplications to God—is very much a statement concerning his own theory of rhetoric. Rhetoric is the art of words, prayer the highest use to which language can be applied. Like prayer, the learned man's speech should be modest, restrained. Above all else he should refrain from abundant wordiness—from meaningless wind and noise—instead applying himself to attentive and thoughtful economy of speech. The prayers of the saints, their humility and their wise restraint, are examples that all good rhetoricians should espouse.

The final word, of course, belongs to Dymytrii. "The Inner Man in the Chamber of his Heart" ends by reaffirming the modest simplicity and the sincere love that govern the soul's *pronunciatio spiritualis*:

> Prayer is the directing of the mind and the thoughts toward God. To pray means to stand before God with one's mind and to attentively gaze at him in one's thoughts and to converse with him in pious fear and hope.
>
> Therefore, gather together all your thoughts and having put aside all your outer worldly cares, place your mind before God and behold him.[467]

---

[466] Visiting Moscow during Holy Week of 1655, Paul of Aleppo remarked, "Having stood from early dawn until now, we did not leave the church till the chiming of the eleventh hour and were cursing our very souls from fatigue. God grant us His special aid to get through the whole of this present week"—Paul of Aleppo, *The Travels of Macarius, 1652–60*, trans. Laura Ridding (New York: Arno, 1971) 46.

[467] «Что есть молитва: Молитва есть обращеніи ума и помышленіи къ Богу. Молитися есть предстояти умомъ своимъ Богу, и зрѣти нань мыслію неуклонною и бесѣдовати къ нему со благоговѣйнымъ страхомъ и

In these words we see the final product of Dymytrii's rhetorical program for spiritual understanding: attentive mindfulness of God's love and kindness expressed through the dialogue of prayer. The principles outlined in the *Spiritual Alphabet* bring order and harmony to the unruly soul and direct human beings toward a meaningful dialogue with God based on mutual love and responsiveness. The spiritual rhetorician must learn the art of prayer to ensure that his supplications are delivered to heaven in a manner conducive to interior reflection and spiritual living. *Pronunciatio spiritualis* is a dialogue of prayer based on mutual respect and reciprocity between Christians and God, and it is governed by the rhetorical ideals of simplicity, modesty and attentiveness. As the soul's eloquent delivery, prayer is essential in the soul's work of leading Christians amid the outward things of the world and directing them toward the interior knowledge of their own inward kingdoms.

упованіемъ. Собери убо вся помышленія твоя, и вся внѣшняя житейская попеченія отложивъ, представи умъ твой Богу, и зри нань»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 155.

Conclusion

In the Introduction, a number of questions were raised: What were Dymytrii's paramount concerns as a writer and a pastor? How did the philological principles of grammar and rhetoric govern his approach to human psychology and Christian ethics? What were the larger, philosophical and theological systems that govern his way of thinking and writing? And, especially, how does the *Spiritual Alphabet* represent the pedagogical sequences for the acquisition of inward wisdom, a concern that was of primary importance to every spiritual text that Dymytrii wrote?

The question concerning Dymytrii's purpose in writing—indeed the purpose behind everything he did—is answered in our knowledge of who he was as a man. First and foremost he was a Christian who throughout his lifetime faithfully rendered his religious loyalties to the Orthodox Church and sacramental life. Secondly he was the product of a unique social and educational milieu that flourished in seventeenth-century Kyiv, that of an Orthodox clerical and secular elite schooled in the philological principles of neo-Latin humanist education. These two factors—Dymytrii's Orthodox faith and his philological background—are the key to understanding everything that he wrote.

As an Orthodox Christian Dymytrii belonged to a community united in one faith, one creed and one sacramental life. He was conscious of this and conscious of the diversity that existed within this one community: Orthodox Kyiv and Orthodox Moscow shared the same faith, but at the same time they existed in two vastly divided intellectual and cultural landscapes.

As a philologist, Dymytrii was conscious of his own membership in an international community of Latin-speaking humanists. His library reveals the extent of his humanist loyalties: the very best writers and intellectuals of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Europe—Luther, Bacon, Descartes, to mention only a few—are represented on his library shelves. Raised in the trilingual atmosphere of Kyiv's Orthodox clerical and secular elite—speaking Ukrainian, Polish and Latin fluently—Dymytrii grew up confident in the Orthodoxy of his own faith and at the same time fluent in the intellectual systems of Early Modern Europe.

A humanist, Dymytrii perceived the bigger landscape of Christianity as a whole and he did so clearly from the perspective of an Orthodox theologian and pastor. The Greek New Testament and the Greek Fathers were indeed part of Erasmus and Loyola's spiritual heritage, but they also constituted Dymytrii's own intimate connection to his ancestral faith and its Byzantine origins. Like all theorists of Christian *paedeia*—be they Catholic, Protestant or Orthodox—Dymytrii understood that the primary task of the Christian author is to lead others along the path of virtuous living and spiritual understanding. Like all mystics of the Baroque, Dymytrii distinguished between the outward prayer of worship and the inward prayer of private devotion. For Dymytrii the real division—the real crisis—that existed within Christianity was not so much the outward division between religious confessions, but the interior disorder and disharmony of the individual human soul. It was not the animosity between Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant that troubled him most, but rather the divisiveness within the human being that drives men and women into spiritual despondency, alienation from themselves, from one another and from God.

This, above all else, was Dymytrii's paramount concern as a writer: to bring peace, order and harmony to the interior world of the troubled human soul. This was the primary purpose of his sermons, his *Reading Menaea*, his dramatic works, his treatises on theology and prayer and especially his *Spiritual*

Alphabet. To deal with this concern, he adopted the humanist, philological approach to problem-solving and created a rhetorical program for the human soul, one by which the inward human being may acquire competency in the requisite subjects for harmonious living.

The first rhetorical component of Dymytrii's program —*inventio spiritualis* (chapter one)—manifests the Orthodox and philological basis of this approach to spiritual learning. Dymytrii demonstrates how pedagogical sequences are the means by which the interior human being is educated in the wisdom of the soul. Humility and obedience to God's will are at the core of the learning sequence, and around this core are structured the requisite subjects of virtuous living: good works, prayer, the ability to distinguish between outward and inward knowledge. God has endowed the human being with free will, understanding and reason, gifts which entail a responsibility to use these resources wisely and virtuously. In return for their learning efforts, men and women receive gifts of knowledge and wisdom, faith and hope and an eternal union with God in love.

In the *Alphabet* 's approach to spiritual inventiveness, we see how neo-Platonism and rhetoric shaped Dymytrii's view of the world surrounding him and the manner in which he interacted with it. For Dymytrii the material world does not stand in opposition to the world of the spirit, because it was created by God and serves as the rhetorical model by which the interior human being acquires knowledge of all things visible and invisible. Specifically, it is the good arrangement and harmonious order of the created world—its hierarchies and its natural laws—that serve as the *exemplum* for spiritual living. Hence, Dymytrii's rhetorical approach to Christian ethics is based on a cosmological, neo-Platonic understanding of the world in which human beings live. Rather than resisting the material world, Christians are to examine it with understanding and direct their sensibilities to the invisible truths that are revealed in God's creation.

Knowledge of the created world leads to knowledge of the self, and self-knowledge brings one to the knowledge of God. Reason and understanding allow men and women good judgement and free will permits them to act accordingly and direct themselves to heaven. The task of the *discipulus spiritualis* is to study all things—to acquire the universal knowledge and understanding of the Renaissance humanist—and to bring order and harmonious arrangement to the interior world of his soul.

The second rhetorical component—*dispositio spiritualis* (chapter two)—demonstrates Dymytrii's belief in the natural goodness of human beings and their natural desire for order and harmony. A neo-Platonist, Dymytrii affirms that the inward arrangement of the human soul reflects the outward arrangement of the cosmos. All things have an exterior and an interior; the soul's exterior is its reason, its interior its conscience. Like grammar, the human being's happiness depends upon the agreement of all his component parts: his body, his interior soul, his exterior soul—these three must be in full cooperation with one another. When there is discord and dissent within the human being, disaster results. Misunderstanding, confusion, doubt, despair and finally sin and corruption afflict the human soul that lives in a state of divisiveness and imbalance.

Dymytrii's anatomy of the human soul demonstrates the connection between ethics and psychology. The act of sin is nothing other than chaos and confusion of the inward person. The human being was created good and naturally inclined to virtue, evil and corruption being an aberration from the human being's true nature based on a misunderstanding. Therefore, Christian ethics requires mental balance, perception and good judgement. The troubled and sinful soul is healed through understanding. Once all things are clearly understood, then faith, hope and virtuous living will follow. Dymytrii's emphasis on the natural goodness of the human being identifies him as a writer squarely within the Eastern patristic tradition. Though doubtless well-read in Counter-Reformation theology, Dymytrii rejects the Western doctrine of the original sin. As an Orthodox theologian he affirms his belief that sin is an aberrant act of personal will and not of human nature. Hence, the task of *dispositio spiritualis* is simply a matter of restoring the human being's natural inclination toward goodness and virtue.

The third rhetorical component—*elocutio spiritualis* (chapter three)—demonstrates the social context within which the *Alphabet*'s program is pursued. Pedagogical theory requires practice; rhetorical inventiveness and arrangement require the force of elocution. Hence, spiritual knowledge requires that Christians apply their understanding to good deeds and acts of charity. To this effect, God has placed human beings in a social classroom where the task of spiritual elocution is to be fully articulated. It is the individual Christian's good works that constitute the power and eloquence that must accompany his spiritual inventiveness and good disposition.

Dymytrii's emphasis on good works goes deeper than the dutiful fulfillment of social and civic obligation advocated by Cicero and the Stoics. More importantly, acts of charity bring the human being closer to Divine presence by uniting the human being's will with that of God. Good deeds are not simply a matter of civic duty: they are requisite if the Christian is to succeed in a loving and mutually responsive relationship with God. The partnership between right thinking and right behavior is the true path to knowing God. The individual who possess knowledge but falls short on good works will never know God. Active pursuit of spiritual understanding through the *elocutio* of good works is requisite, for without deeds all knowledge is barren and devoid of true meaning.

The fourth rhetorical component—*memoria spiritualis* (chapter four)—demonstrates the connection that Dymytrii makes between sensibility and perception in the art of spiritual living. Though the material world is not evil, the sensibilities may easily lead men and women astray if they do not possess the requisite mindfulness that tempers their perceptions and allows them to clearly discern between truth and falsehood. The sensibility of the body is on one level; the sensibility of the soul, however, is on a higher level. It is spiritual perception that must be nurtured and allowed to flourish if the human being is to live his life in the fullness of wisdom and spiritual understanding.

For Dymytrii the role of the five senses in the art of spiritual *memoria* is crucial, for the senses are the windows by which the soul perceives the world and through which the world leaves its impressions upon the soul. The sensibility of the body is given to the human being at birth; the sensibility of the soul, however, must be cultivated through obedience to God's will, good works and prayer. If Christians apply their five senses to the task of spiritual perception, then their mindfulness of God's love and benevolence—*memoria spiritualis*—will enable them to navigate through the sea of spiritual dangers and temptations that surround them.

The fifth rhetorical component—*pronunciatio spiritualis* (chapter five)—demonstrates the practical application of the *Alphabet*'s rhetorical program to the most important communicative act of all: the human being's loving and hopeful dialogue with his God through prayer. As in all things, Dymytrii reminds his readers that prayer has both an inward and an outward aspect. The outward aspect of prayer is liturgy and its requires dutiful attendance at divine services and obligatory participation in communal worship. At the same time, however, Christians are also called to an interior prayer life—a voluntary and individual devotion that takes place not in public, but in the interior chamber of the human heart. Like Dymytrii's rhetoric, his idea of *pronunciatio spiritualis* is based on modesty, economy and restraint in conjunction with attentiveness, zeal and warm love for the one who is being addressed. If a person is sincerely moved by Divine love, he will retreat to the invisible chamber of his heart as frequently as possible and gaze upon God's presence with his thoughts and conversing with him in pious fear, hope and love. Interior prayer is thus the highest application of Dymytrii's program for spiritual wisdom. The good order and disposition of the interior self, the disciplining of the self through obedience to God's commandments and though acts of love and kindness, these things find their fruition in the human being's meaningful and responsive dialogue with God —*pronunciatio spiritualis*—though an interior prayer life based on mutual love and respect.

Dymytrii's *Spiritual Alphabet* serves as a key to understanding the author as an Early Modern pastor, philologist and pedagogue. Most importantly, Dymytrii's *rhetorica spiritualis* provides an *Orthodox* program for spiritual understanding. Although modeled on pedagogical theories originating in the Christian West, particularly those of the humanists and of the Jesuits, Dymytrii's *Alphabet* is intimately tied to the spirit of the Christian East—its prayer life, its sense of continuity with the Greek Fathers, the Slavonic Bible and Liturgy, its emphasis on the Holy Spirit and its fulfillment in the sacramental life of the Eastern Church. It was Dymytrii's unique ability to intellectually harmonize Western humanism with Eastern theology that mark him as one of the most extraordinary theologians and philologists of his time. Neither resisting the West (as did his opponents Evfimii Chudovsky and Patriarch Ioakim) nor permitting its Counter-Reformation theology to affect the teaching of Orthodox doctrine (as did Symeon Polotsky and Lazar Baranovych), Dymytrii steered a middle course, in which he borrowed the best intellectual systems of the Christian West and applied them to a sound teaching of Orthodox dogma based on original patristic and scriptural sources.

The *Spiritual Alphabet* reveals the seminal role that humanist education played in Dymytrii's intellectual development. Ignatius Loyola's educational model, based on a systematic, orderly and sequential approach to the teaching of children, is reflected in Dymytrii's own belief that the human soul, too, requires an well-organized and highly disciplined program of spiritual learning in order to grow and flourish.The Jesuit belief that a good education must impart a sense of public duty to the child and at the same time instill an inward piety that directs the him to heaven, is mirrored in the *Spiritual Alphabet's* emphasis on good works and interior prayer life. Dymytrii follows in Loyola's belief that a Christian's inward disposition should be reflected in his harmonious and benevolent interaction with the world around him.

Not only for Loyola, but for Erasmus and Teresa of Avila this distinction between inward and outward piety was central to their Early Modern sensibilities. For Dymytrii, however, this distinction was even more critical due to the religious circumstances of his own life. His life's path took him away from the cosmopolitan diversity of Kyiv and into the formalist, rigid conservatism of Muscovy, where even the desire for a private devotional life made a cleric suspect in the eyes of his coreligionists. Dymytrii's lifelong conflict with religious conservatism was due to his ability to distinguish clearly between interior and outward forms of devotion, while his opponents either could not, or would not.

The *Spiritual Alphabet*, with its emphasis on inward piety and good works, radically deviated from the dominant religious culture of Muscovy at the dawn of the eighteenth century. The dominant concern of church life in Rostov was the Old Ritualists' schism: the number of fingers used to make the sign of the cross and the use of certain spellings in prayer books and in inscriptions on icons were the main topics of religious debate. Although Dymytrii capably responded to these issues and affirmed the status of the official Orthodox Church over Old Ritualism, his deepest concerns were always with the interior human being, the wellness of the human soul and the Christian obligation to love one another in an atmosphere of kindness and mutual respect.

Within the context of Early Modern East Slavic literature, the *Spiritual Alphabet* is an extraordinary work of spiritual writing unlike anything that appeared prior to it. To find a substantial, similar philosophical text devoted to the subject of interior piety, it is necessary to turn to a writer born more than sixty years after Dymytrii's death: Hryhorii Skovoroda. The connection between these two writers cannot be overlooked, given the extraordinary publication history and circulation of the *Spiritual Alphabet* throughout the eighteenth century, and the fact that Skovoroda even titled one of his colloquies, *The Alphabet or The Primer of the World.* Dymytrii's *Alphabet* doubtless had a profound effect on Ukrainian and Russian intellectual life during the course of the eighteenth century.

In many ways Dymytrii's *Alphabet* continues to challenge Christian believers, both Orthodox and non-Orthodox, by reminding them of the social responsibility that accompanies true faith. The *elocutio spiritualis* of good works and the *pronunciatio spiritualis* of interior prayer, are easily neglected in the midst of outward, formal ritualism. The *Spiritual Alphabet*, with its simple and orderly approach to the subject of interior wisdom, provides a key to all readers who wish to understand the Metropolitan of Rostov, his way of thinking and his way of writing. His spiritual pedagogy is one to which men and women who seek inward peace and understanding may readily turn. In the final analysis, Dymytrii is among the finest of rhetoricians, for he leaves his readers with a profound message that is persuasive, uplifting, spiritually delightful and readily understood by those who desire to listen.

Bibliography of Texts Cited and Works Consulted

1. Church History
2. Devotional Literature: Primary Sources
3. Devotional Literature: Secondary Sources
4. Dymytrii of Rostov: Primary Sources
5. Dymytrii of Rostov: Secondary Sources
6. Literary History and Criticism
7. Pedagogical Theory: Primary Sources
8. Pedagogical Theory: Secondary Sources
9. Philosophy: Primary Sources
10. Philosophy: Secondary Sources
11. Rhetoric: Primary Sources
12. Rhetoric: Secondary Sources
13. Sacred Philology, Scriptures, Theology

1. Church History

Gajecky, George. "The Kiev Mohyla Academy and the Hetmanate." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8.1/2 (1984): 81–92.

Hryniv, Ie. A., ed. *Sekularyzatsiia dukhovnoho zhyttia na Ukraini v epokhu humanizmu i Reformatsii.* Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1991.

Nichyk, V. M. *Humanistychni i reformatsiini idei na Ukraini: XVI–pochatok XVII st.* Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1990.

Ohienko, Ivan (Metropolitan Ilarion). *Ukrains'ka tserkva za chas ruiny.* Winnipeg: Trident P, 1956.

Paul of Aleppo. *The Travels of Macarius, 1652–60.* Trans. Laura Ridding. New York: Arno, 1971.

Senyk, Sophia. *Women's Monasteries in Ukraine and Belorussia to the Period of Suppressions.* Rome: Orientalia Christiana, 1983.

Ševčenko, Ihor. *Ukraine Between East and West.* Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies P, 1996.

Titov, Feodor. *K istorii Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii.* Kyiv, 1910.

Trachevskii, Aleksandr. *Russkaia istoriia.* St. Petersburg, 1895.

Vlasovsky, Ivan. *Narys istorii ukrains'koi pravoslavnoi tserkvy.* New York and South Bound Brook: Ukrainian Orthodox Church of USA, 1955–77. 5 vols.

2. Devotional Literature: Primary Sources

Climacus, *Ladder of Divine Ascent.* Trans. Colm Luibneid and Norman Russell. New York: Paulist P, 1982.

Comenius, John (Komensky, Jan). *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart.* Trans. Matthew Spinka. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1972.

van Engen, John, ed. and trans. *Devotio Moderna: Basic Writings.* New York: Paulist P, 1988.

Kadloubovsky, E. and G. Palmer, trans. *Writings from the Philokalia on Prayer of the Heart.* London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1951.

Teresa of Avila. *The Interior Castle (The Mansions).* Trans. E. Allison Peers. London: Sheed and Ward,1974.

Ward, Benedicta. *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers.* London and Oxford: Mowbray and Cistercian Publications. 1975.

3. Devotional Literature: Secondary Sources

Creasy, William C. *The Imitation of Christ by Thomas à Kempis: A New Reading.* Macon: Mercer UP, 1989.

Giles, Mary. *The Poetics of Love: Meditations with John of the Cross.* New York: P. Lang, 1986.

Hyma, Albert. *The Christian Renaissance: A History of the Devotio Moderna.* New York: Century, 1965.

Perry, T. Anthony. *Erotic Spirituality: The Integrative Tradition from Leone Ebreo to John Donne.* University: U of Alabama P, 1980.

Post, R. R. *The Modern Devotion: Confrontation with Reformation and Humanism = Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1968.

4. Dymytrii of Rostov: Primary Sources

[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov]. *Alfavit Dukhovnyi.* Kyiv, 1741.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Cheti-Minei* (*Reading Menaea*). Book 2. Kyiv, 1695.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Kafedral'nye Chernigovskie monastyri: Il'inskii, Eletskii i Borisoglebskii, s prilozheniem nieskol'kikh neizdannykh sochinenii Sv. Dimitriia i mnogikh gramat.* Ed. unknown. Chernihiv, 1861.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Psalmy, ili Dukhovnye kanty sviatitelia Dimitriia, Mitropolita Rostovskago*. Ed. Aristarkh Izrailev. Moscow, 1891.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Iz neizdannykh sochinenii sviatitelia Dimitriia Mitropolita Rostovskago*. Ed. Amfilokhii, Bishop of Uglich. Moscow, 1889.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. "Komediia na Rozhdestvo Khristovo." In Rezanov, V. *Drama ukrains'ka* 4: 81–145. Kyiv: Ukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk, 1928 (Reprint, Düsseldorf: Slavica, 1970). 6 vols.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. "Komediia na Uspenie Bohoroditsy." In Rezanov, V. *Drama ukrains'ka* 5: 191–238. Kyiv, 1928. (Reprint, Düsseldorf, 1970). 6 vols.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Keleinyi letopisets sviatitelia Dimitriia Mitropolita Rostovskago*. Ed. Andrei Titov. Moscow, 1892.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Propovedi sviatitelia Dimitriia Mitropolita Rostovskago na ukrainskom narechii*. Ed. and intro. Andrei Titov. Moscow, 1909.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. "Razsuzhdenie o presushchestvlenii sviateishei evkharistii." *O vremeni presushchestvleniia sviatykh darov. Spor byvshii v Moskve, vo vtoroi polovine XVII-go veka (Opyt istoricheskago izsledovaniia)*. Ed. Grigorii Mirkovich. Vilnius, 1886.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Rozysk o raskolnicheskoi brynskoi vere*. Kyiv, 1748.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. "Slovo sviatitelia Dimitriia, Mitropolita Rostovskago, v den' Sviatyia Troitsy." Ed. E. Barsov. *Chtenia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskykh* 2 (1884): 82–106.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Sochineniia sviatitelia Dimitriia, Mitropolita Rostovskago v 5-kh chastiakh*. 5 vols. Moscow, 1842.

Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov. *Stikhi na Strasti Hospodni ili Stikhi Strastnye sviatitelia Dimitriia, Mitropolita Rostovskago*. Ed. Amfilokhii, Bishop of Uglich. Iaroslavl', 1889.

5. Dymytrii of Rostov: Secondary Sources

Bednarsky, Dushan. "Blood and Tears, Love and Death: Seventeenth-Century Devotional Homoeroticism and Tuptalo's 'Verses on the Lord's Passion'." *Canadian Slavonic Papers*. 38.1–2 (1996): 61–92.

Bednarsky, Dushan. "Dymytrij Tuptalo's Ukrainian Sermons: A Study in Kyivan Rhetoric" MA diss., U of Alberta, 1991.

Bednarsky, Dushan. "East and West in the Theology of Dymytrij Tuptalo." *The Influence of Orthodoxy and Western Christianity on Society: A Comparative Approach.* Paris: Maison des Sciences d'Homme, forthcoming.

Bednarsky, Dushan. "Ex abundantia enim cordis os loquitur: Dymytrij Tuptalo's Ukrainian Sermons and the Kievan Rhetorical Model." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 17.1–2 (1992): 217–243.

Berndt, Michael. *Die Predigt Dimitrij Tuptalos: Studien zur ukrainischen und russischen Barockpredigt.* Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1975.

Bolkhovitnikov, Evgenii. *Slovar' o russkikh pisateliakh greko-rossiiskoi tserkvi* . 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1827.

Brogi Bercoff, Giovanna. "The 'Letopisec' of Dimitrij Tuptalo, The Metropolitan of Rostov, in the Context of Western European Culture," *Ricerche Slavistiche* 39-40 / 1 (1992-1993): 293–364.

Bulgakov, Metropolitian Makarii. "Sviatyi Dimitriia Rostovskago, sviatitelia i chudotvortsa, dogmaticheskoe uchenie, vybranoe iz ego sochinenii." *Khristianskoe chtenie, izdanie pri Sankpeterburgskoi dukhovnoi akademii* 4 (1842): 467–469.

Eingorn, Vitalii. *Ocherki iz istorii Malorossii XVII v. I. O snosheniiakh malorossiiskago dukhovenstva z Moskovskim pravitelstvom v tsarstvovanie Alekseia Mikhailovicha.* Moscow, 1899.

Gumilevskyi, Archbishop Filaret. *Obzor russkoi dukhovnoi literatury. Kniga pervaia i vtoraia 862–1863* . St. Petersburg, 1884.

Makkaveiskii, N. "Sviatyi Dimitrii, mitropolit Rostovskii, kak pastyr i pastrolog." *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii* (1910) 1: 22–64.

Nechaev, Bishop Vissarion. *Sviatyi Dimitrii, Mitropolit Rostovskii.* Moscow, 1910.

Nikolskii, Aleksandr. "Neskolko slov o zhitii i sochineniiakh sviatago Dimitriia Rostovskago. *Izvestiia otdeleniia russkago iazika i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk* 14 (1910): 160–171.

Ohienko, Ivan (Metropolitan Ilarion). *Sv. Dymytrii Tuptalo—ioho zhyttia i pratsia.* Winnipeg: Vira i Kul'tura, 1960.

Popov, Mikhail. *Sviatitel' Dimitrii Rostovskii i ego trudy.* St. Petersburg, 1910.

Poselianin, E. *Russkaia tserkov i russkie podvizhniki.* St. Petersburg, 1905.

Szporluk, Mary Ann and I. R. Titunik. "Ukrainian Baroque Drama in Translation." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 24 (1988): 12–16.

Shliapkin, Illia. *Sviatitel Dimitrii Rostovskii i ego vremia*. St. Petersburg, 1891.

Stroev, Mikhail. *Bibliologicheskii slovar' i chernovye k nemu materialy P. M. Stroeva*. Ed. A. Bychkov. St. Petersburg, 1882.

Titov, Andrei. "Sviatyi Dimitrii Mitropolit Rostovskii." *Russkii Arkhiv* (1895) 2: 5–16.

Titov, Feodor. "K istorii Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii v XVII–XVIII vv. II. Sviatyi Dimitrii, mitropolit Rostovskii, byvshei uchenik Akademii [1651–1709]," *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi adademii* (1909) 10: 173–239.

Nikolai Vasilenko. "Zasedanie 8-go noiabria 1909. Svedeniia o zasedaniiakh Istoricheskago obshchestva Nestora Letopistsa s 27-go oktiabria 1909 g. do 2y-e oktiabria 1910 g. (Doklad na temu Dimitrii Rostovskii i ego literaturnaia deiatel'nost')," *Chteniia v Istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa* 22 (1911) 3: 80–83.

6. Literary History and Criticism

Arkhangel'skii, Aleksandr. *Iz lektsii po istorii russkoi literatury*. Kazan', 1913.

Askochenskii, Viktor. *Kiev s drevneishim ego uchilishchem akademieiu*. Kyiv, 1856.

de Backer, Augustin, ed. *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*. Louvain: Éditions de la Bibliothèque S. J., 1960. 12 vols.

Backvis, Claude. *Renesans i barok w Polsce: Studia o kulturze*. Warsaw: Polskie Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1993.

Baïche, André. *La naissance du baroque français: poésie et image de la Pléiade à Jean de La Ceppède*. Toulouse: University of Toulouse-le-Mirail, 1976.

Baldwin, Charles. *Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice: Classicism and the Rhetoric and Poetic of Italy, France and England 1400–1600*. New York: Columbia UP, 1959.

Bartlett, Kenneth, ed. *Love and Death in the Renaissance*. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1991.

Bertonasco, Marc F. *Crashaw and the Baroque*. University: U of Alabama P, 1971.

Bieman, Elizabeth. *Plato Baptized: Towards the Interpretation of Spencer's Mimetic Fictions*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1988.

Bienkowski, Tadeusz. *Antyk w literaturze i kulturze staropolskiej (1450–1750): glowne problemy i kierunki recepcji*. Wroclaw: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1976.

Bono, Barbara J. *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedy*. Berkeley: U of California, 1984.

Brink, Jean R., ed. *Playing with Gender: A Renaissance Pursuit*. Urbana: U of Illinois, 1991.

Browning, Robert Marcellus. *German Baroque Poetry 1618–1723*. Pittsburgh: Pennsylvania State UP, 1971.

Brownlee, Kevin, ed. *Discourses of Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*. Hanover: UP of New England, 1989.

Buffum, Imbrie. *Studies in the Baroque from Montaigne to Rotrou*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1957.

Cave, Terence. *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979.

Cioranescu, Alexandre. *Le masque et le visage: du baroque espagnol au classicisme français*. Geneva: Libr. Droz, 1983.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. New York: Pantheon, 1953.

Daly, Peter M. *The English Emblem and the Continental Tradition*. New York: AMS Press, 1988.

Diehl, Huston. *An Index of Icons in English Emblem Books 1500–1700*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986.

Dłuska, Maria. *Studia z historii i teorii wersyfikacji polskiej*. Warsaw: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1978. 2 vols.

Donne, John. *The Divine Poems*. Ed. Helen Gardner. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1952.

Drucker, Johanna. *The Alphabetic Labyrinth: The Letters in History and Imagination*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995.

Dubois, Claude-Glibert. *Mots et règles, jeux et délires: études sur l'imaginaire verbal au XVIe siècle*. Caen: Paradigme, 1992.

Falecka, Barbara. *Sztuka tworzenia: podmiot autorski w poezji kunsztownej polskiego baroku*. Wroclaw: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1983.

Frick, David. *Meletij Smotryc'kyj*. Cambridge: Harvard UP. 1995.

Fumaroli, Marc. *L'âge de l'éloquence: Rhétorique et res literaria de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique*. Geneva: Droz, 1980.

Galakhov, Aleksei. *Istoriia russkoi slovesnosti drevnei i novoi*. St. Petersburg, 1880.

Giamati, A. B. *Exile and Change in Renaissance Literature*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1984.

Gillespie, Gerald E. P. *Garden and Labyrinth of Time: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Literature*. New York: P. Lang, 1988.

Giraud, Yves. *L'Emblème a la Renaissance*. Paris: Société d'Édition d'Enseignement Supérieur, 1982.

Goldberg, Johathan, ed. *Queering the Renaissance*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 1994.

Gostynska, Dorota. *Retoryka iluzji: koncept w poezji barowkowej*. Warsaw: Polska Adademia Nauk, 1991.

Grabowski, Tadeusz. *Historja literatury polskiej*. Poznań, 1936.

Grassi, Ernesto. *Folly and Insanity in Renaissance Literature*. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1988.

Greene, Thomas M. *The Vulnerable Text: Essays on Renaissance Literature*. New York: Columbia UP, 1986.

Hernas, Czeslaw. *Barok*. Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1976.

Jensen, H. James. *The Muses' Concord: Literature, Music, and the Visual Arts in the Baroque Age*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1976.

Jordan, Constance. *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.

Kaczmarek, Marian, ed. *Barok i barokowość w literaturze polskiej; referaty i komunikaty przedstawione na sesji naukowej w dniach 13–14 kwietnia 1983 r.* Opole: Wyzsza Szkola Pedagogiczna, 1985.

Kelly, Douglas. *The Arts of Poetry and Prose*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1991.

Kholshevnikov, V. ed. *Teoriia stikha* . Leningrad: Nauka, 1968.

Kinney, Arthur F. *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1986.

Kinney, Arthur F. *Continental Humanist Poets: Studies in Erasmus, Castiglione, Marguerite de Navarre, Rabelais and Cervantes*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1989.

Klaniczay,Tibor, Eva Kushner and André Stegmann, eds. *L'époque de la Renaissance 1400–1600*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988. 4 vols.

Kolosova, V., ed. *Ukrains'ka poeziia kinets' XVI pochatok XVII st*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1978.

Krailsheimer, A. J. *The Continental Renaissance 1500–1600*. New York: Penguin, 1971.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*. Rome: Edizioni di storia e litteratura, 1969–96. 4 vols.

Krynen, Jean. "Aperçus sur le Baroque et la Théologie Spirituelle." *Baroque Revue Internationale* 1 (1963): 27–35.

Larson, Deborah. *John Donne and Twentieth-Century Criticism*. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1989.

Maiorino, Giancarlo. *The Cornucopian Mind and the Baroque Unity of the Arts*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1990.

Makhnovets', Leonid. *Ukrains'ki pys'mennyky: bio-biohrafichnyi zbirnyk*. 5 vols. Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhnoi literatury, 1960.

Marsh, David. *The Quattrocento dialogue: Classical Tradition and Humanist Innovation*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1980.

Marshall, Richard H. Jr., and Thomas E. Bird, eds. *Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles*. Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1994.

Martz, Louis Lohr. *From Renaissance to Baroque: Essays on Literature and Art*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1991.

Mykytas', L., ed. *Ukrains'ke literaturne barokko: zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1987.

Myshanych, O., ed. *Ievropeis'ke vidrodzhennia ta ukrains'ka literatura XIV–XVIII st*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1993.

Myshanych, O., ed. *Ukrains'ka literatura XVII st*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1987.

Newman, Barbara. *Saint Hildegard of Bingen: Symphonia*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988.

Osmond, Rosalie. *Mutual Accusation: Seventeenth-Century Body and Soul Dialogues in Their Literary and Theological Context*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990.

Parente, James Jr. *Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition: Christian Theater in Germany and the Netherlands 1500–1680 =Studies in the History of Christian Thought*, vol. 29. Ed. Heiko A. Oberman. Leiden, New York and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1987.

Parker, Patricia, ed. *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1986.

Patterson, Annabel M. *Hermogenes and the Renaissance Seven Ideas of Style*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970.

Paz, Octavio. *Sor Juana*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1988.

Pelc, Janusz. *Barok-epoka przeciwienstw*. Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1993.

Pelc, Janusz. *Obraz-słowo-znak: Studium o emblematach w literaturze staropolskiej*. Warsaw: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1973.

Petrov, Nikolai. *Ocherki z istorii ukrainskoi literatury XVII i XVIII v.* Kyiv, 1911.

Petukhov, Evgenii. *Russkaia literatura*. Iur'ev, 1912.

Picchio, Riccardo, ed. *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*. Columbus: Slavica, 1984. 2 vols.

Picchio, Riccardo. "The Impact of Ecclesiastic Culture on Old Russian Literary Techniques." *Medieval Russian Culture*. Eds. Henrik Birnbaum and Michael Flier. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.

Porfir'ev, Ivan. *Istoriia russkoi slovesnosti*. Kazan', 1879.

Pylypiuk, Natalia. "The Primary Door: At the Threshold of Skovoroda's Theology and Poetics." In *Adelphotes*, a special issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14 (1990): 551–83.

Pypin, Aleksandr. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*. St. Petersburg, 1898.

Quinones, Ricardo J. *The Renaissance Discovery of Time*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1972.

Quint, David. *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature: Versions of the Source*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.

Rezanov, Volodymyr. *Drama ukrains'ka*. 6 vols. Kyiv: Ukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk,1928 (Reprint, Düsseldorf: Slavica, 1970).

Roston, Murray. *Milton and the Baroque*. London: Macmillan, 1980.

Sáez, Richard. *Theodicy in Baroque Literature*. New York: Garland, 1985.

Schiesari, Juliana. *The Gendering of Melancholia: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Symbolics of Love in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1992.

Segel, Harold. *Renaissance Culture in Poland: The Rise of Humanism 1470–1543* . Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989.

Sencourt, Robert. *Outflying Philosophy: A Literary Study of the Religious Element in the Poems and Letters of John Donne and the Works of Sir Thomas Brown and of Henry Vaughan the Silurist*. New York: Haskell House, 1966.

Shakespeare, William.*The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. London: Abbey Library, 1977.

Shapiro, Gavriel. *Nikolai Gogol and the Baroque Cultural Heritage*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1993.

Simpson, Evelyn. *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1948.

Sloane, Thomas O. *Donne, Milton and the End of Humanist Rhetoric* . Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.

Smith, Bruce R. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Spahr, Blake Lee. *Problems and Perspectives: A Collection of Essays on German Baroque Literature*. Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1981.

Speranskii, Mikhail. *Istoriia drevnei russkoi literatury*. Moscow: Sabashnikov, 1921.

Stanchfield, Gordana. "Russian Baroque: A. D. Kantemir" PhD diss., Florida State U, 1977.

Stanwood, P. G., ed. *John Donne and the Theology of Language*. Columbia: U of Missouri, 1986.

Steadman, John M. *Redefining a Period Style: "Renaissance," "Mannerist" and Baroque" in Literature*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1990.

Strumiński, Bohdan. "Pre-Nineteenth Century Ukrainian." *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*. Columbus: Slavica, 1984.

Sumtsov, Nikolai. "Ioannikii Galiatovskii." *Kievskaia Starina* (1884) 6: 1–201.

Sumtsov, Nikolai. *Lazar Baranovich*. Kharkiv, 1885.

Sumtsov, Nikolai. *O literaturnykh nravakh iuzhnorusskikh pisatelei XVIII veka*. St. Petersburg, 1906.

Sydorenko, Halyna. *Virshuvannia v ukrainskii literaturi*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1962.

Ternovskii, Filipp. "Mitropolit Stefan Iavorskii." *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*. (1864) 1: 36–70; 3: 237–290.

Tschizewskij, Dmitrij (Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi). *A History of Russian Literature from the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1960.

Tschizewskij, Dmitrij (Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi). *A History of Ukrainian Literature from the 11th to the 19th Century*. Trans. Dolly Ferguson. Littleton: Ukrainian Acad. P, 1975.

Tschizewskij, Dmitrij (Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi). *Literárny barok*. Bratislava: Slovenska akademie vied, 1971.

Tschizewskij, Dmitrij (Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi). *Poza mezhamy krasy: do estetyky barokkovoi literatury*. New York: Ukrainian American Publishers' Society, 1952.

Tschizewskij, Dmitrij (Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi), ed. *Slavische Barockliteratur*. Munich: W. Fink, 1970.

Tylus, Jane. *Writing and Vulnerability in the Late Renaissance*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1993.

Vinge, Louise. *The Five Senses: A Study in a Literary Tradition*. Lund: Liber Laromedel, 1975.

Vozniak, Mykhailo. *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury*. 2 vols. L'viv: Prosvita, 1921.

Warnke, Frank. *John Donne*. Boston: Twayne, 1987.

Warnke, Frank. J. *Versions of Baroque: European Literature in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1972.

Webber, Joan. *Contrary Music: The Prose Style of John Donne*. Madison: U of Wisconsin, 1963.

Welleck, René. *Theory of Literature*. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, 1956.

Wlodarski, Maciej. *Barokowa poezja epicedialna: analizy*. Cracow: Universitas, 1993.

7. Pedagogical Theory: Primary Sources

Comenius, John (Komenský, Jan Amos). *Comenius*. Trans. John Sadler. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1969.

Comenius, John (Komenský, Jan Amos). *Comenius's Pampaedia or Universal Education*. Trans. A. Dobbie. Dover: Buckland Publications, 1986.

Howie, George, trans. and ed. *Aristotle on Education*. Translation and Introduction by George Howie. New York: Collier-Macmillan, 1968.

Loyola, Ignatius. *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*. Trans. and intro. George E. Ganss. St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Studies, 1970.

8. Pedagogical Theory: Secondary Sources

Bush, Douglas. *The Renaissance and English Humanism*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1939.

Halkin, Léon-E. *Erasmus: A Critical Biography*. Trans. John Tonkin. Oxford: Blackwell P, 1993.

Harrison Woodward, William. *Desiderius Erasmus Concerning the Aim and Method of Education*. New York: Teachers' College of Columbia UP, 1964.

Howie, George. *Educational Theory and Practice in St. Augustine*. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1969.

Jabłonowski, Alexander. *Akademia kijowsko-Mohylańska*. Cracow, 1899–1900.

Kelly, Donald. *Renaissance Humanism*. Boston: Twayne, 1991.

Kharlampovich, Konstantin. *Zapadnorusskiia pravoslavnyia shkoly XVI i nachala XVII veka*. Kazan', 1898.

Khyzhniak, Zoia. *Kyievo-Mohylians'ka akademiia*. Kyiv: Vyshcha Shkola, 1981.

Kohl, Benjamin. *Renaissance Humanism 1300–1550: A Bibliography of Materials in English*. New York and London: Garland, 1985.

Lodge, R. C. *Plato's Theory of Education.* New York: Russell and Russell, 1970.

Mitiurov, Borys. *Pedahohichi idei Iana Amosa Komens'koho na Ukraini.* Kyiv: Radians'ka Shkola, 1971.

Okenfuss, Max. *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia: Pagan Authors, Ukrainians, and the Resiliency of Muscovy.* Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1995.

Okenfuss, Max. *The Discovery of Childhood in Russia: The Evidence of the Slavic Primer.* Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1980.

Okenfuss, Max. "The Jesuit Origins of Petrine Education." *The Eighteenth Century in Russia.* Ed. J. Garrard. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1973.

Watson, Foster. *The English Grammar Schools to 1600: Their Curriculum and Practice.* London: Cass, 1968.

9. Philosophy: Primary Sources

Albinus. *The Handbook of Platonism.* Trans. John Dillon. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1993.

Allen, Michael J., trans. *Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1981.

Ficino, Marsilio. *Liber de vita.* Trans. Charles Boer. Dallas: Spring Publications, 1980.

Ficino, Marsilio. *Marsilio Ficino's Commentary on Plato's Symposium.* Trans. and intro. Jayne Sears Reynolds. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1944.

The Neoplatonists. Trans. and intro. John Gregory. London: Kyle Cathie, 1991.

Plato: The Collected Dialogues Including the Letters. Eds. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1961.

Simplicius of Cilicia [*Simplicii in libros Aristotelis De anima commentaria.* English]. *On Aristotle's "On the Soul" 1.1–2.4.* Trans. J. O. Urmson. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.

Vives, Juan Luis. *The Passions of the Soul.* Trans. Carlos G. Noreña =*Studies in Renaissance Literature* 4. Lewiston: E. Mellen P, 1990.

Vives, Juan Luis. *Vives' Introduction to Wisdom.* Trans. Marian Leona Tobriner. New York: Teachers College P, 1968.

10. Philosophy: Secondary Sources

Allen, Michael J. B. *Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1981.

Allen, Michael J. B. *The Platonism of Marsilio Ficino: A Study of his Phaedrus Commentary, its Sources and Genesis.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1962.

Blumenthal, H. J. *Soul and Intellect: Studies in Plotinus and later Neoplatonism.* Aldershot: Variorum, 1993.

Bubacz, Bruce. *St. Augustine's Theory of Knowledge: A Contemporary Analysis =Texts and Studies in Religion* 11. New York and Toronto: E. Mellen P, 1981.

Cheney, Liana. *Quattrocento Neoplatonism in Boticelli's Mythological Paintings.* Lanham: University Press of America, 1985.

Coffin, Charles Monroe. *John Donne and the New Philosophy.* New York: Columbia UP, 1958.

Eisenbichler, Konrad, ed. *Ficino and Renaissance Neoplatonism.* Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1986.

Gersh, Stephen. *Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism: The Latin Tradition.* Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1986.

Harper, George Mills. *The Neoplatonism of William Blake.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1961.

Levack, Brian P., ed. *Renaissance Magic.* New York: Garland, 1992.

Merlan, Philip. *From Platonism to Neoplatonism.* 3rd ed. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975.

O'Connor. D., ed. *A Critical History of Western Philosophy.* New York: Free Press, 1964.

Sambursky, Samuel. *The Concept of Place in Late Neoplatonism.* Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982.

White, David. *Rhetoric and Reality in Plato's Phaedrus.* Albany: State U of New York P, 1993.

11. Rhetoric: Primary Sources

Aristotle. *Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse.* Trans. and intro. George A. Kennedy. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.

Augustine [Rhetoric] *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* ser. 1 vol. 2. Trans. Marcus Dods. Ed. J. F. Shaw. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

[Cicero]. *Ad Herennium de Ratione Dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium).* Trans. Harry Caplan. Harvard: Harvard UP, 1954.

Cicero, *De inventione.* Trans. H. M. Hubbell. London: Cambridge UP, 1949.

Cicero. *De Oratore,* Books 1–2. Trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackam. London: Cambridge UP, 1948.

Cicero. *De Oratore,* Book 3; *De Fato; Paradoxa Stoicorum; De Partitione Oratoria.* Trans. H. Rackam. London: Cambridge UP, 1942.

Donne, John. *The Sermons of John Donne in Ten Volumes.* Ed. Evelyn Simpson and George R. Potter. Berkeley: U of California P, 1958.

Franklin, Simon. *The Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus' =Harvard Library of Early Modern Ukrainian Literature. Translations* 5. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991.

Galiatovs'kyi, Ioanykii. *Kliuch rozuminnia.* Ed. V. V. Nimchuk. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1985.

Iavorys'kyi, Stefan. *Ruka ritoricheskaia piatiu chast'mi.* In *Izdanie Obshchestva Liubitelei Drevnei Pis'mennosti.* 20 (1878): 596ff.

Peacham, Henry Crane. *The Garden of Eloquence (1593).* G. William, ed. [Facsimile reproduction]. Gainsville: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1954.

Quintilian. *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian.* Trans. H. E. Butler. London: Heinemann, 1921–22. 3 vols.

Quintilian. *Quintilian on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing. Translations from Books One, Two, and Ten of the Institutio Oratoria.* Ed. James J. Murphy. Carbondale and Edwardville: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.

12. Rhetoric: Secondary Sources

Bailey, Dudley, ed. *Essays on Rhetoric.* New York: Oxford UP, 1965.

Baldwin, Charles. *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic.* Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1959.

Barilli, Renato. *Rhetoric =Theory and History of Literature* 63. Trans. Giuliana Menozzi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1989.

Bitzer, Lloyd. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1963.

Burks, Don. *Rhetoric, Philosophy and Literature: An Exploration*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 1978.

Carrithers, Gale. *Donne at Sermon: A Christian Existentialist World*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1972.

Clark, Donald Lemen. *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance: A Study of Rhetorical Terms in English Literary Criticism*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Conley, Thomas N. *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990.

Covino, William. *The Art of Wondering: A Revisionist Return to the History of Rhetoric*. Portsmouth: Boynton and Cook,1988.

Dixon, Peter. *Rhetoric*. London: Methuen, 1971.

Grimaldi, William A., *Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1972.

Hampton, Timothy. *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.

Herr, Alan Fager. *The Elizabethan Sermon: A Survey and a Bibliography*. New York: Octagon Books, 1969.

Ijsseling, Samuel. *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Conflict: An Historical Survey*. The Hague: Samuel IJsseling, 1976.

Kennedy, William. *Rhetorical Norms in Renaissance Literature*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1978.

Langsch, Johannes. *De Predigten der Coena Spiritualis von Simeon Polockij*. Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 1968.

Langsch, Johannes. "Zur Charakteristik Simeon Polockijs als Prediger." *Kyrios* 5 (1940/41): 82–130.

Markovskii, M. *Antonii Radivilovskii, Iuzhno-russkii propovednik XVII veka*. Kyiv, 1884.

Matseevich, L. "Polskii propovednik XVII veka Iezuit Foma Mlodzianovskii." *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* (1870) 2: 103–113.

McKerrow, Ray E., ed. *Explorations in Rhetoric: Studies in Honor of Douglas Ehninger*. Glenview: Scott and Foresman, 1982.

McWilliam, Joanne, ed. *Augustine, from Rhetor to Theologian*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier UP , 1992.

Miller, Joseph M., ed. *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1973.

Morse, Ruth. *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Mouchel, Christian. *Cicéron et Sénèque dans la rhétorique de la Renaissance*. Marburg: Hitzeroth, 1990.

Mueller, William R. *John Donne: Preacher*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962.

Murphy, James J., ed. *Renaissance Rhetoric: A Short-Title Catalogue on Rhetorical Theory from the Beginning of Printing to A.D. 1700, with Special Attention to the Holdings of the Bodleian Library, Oxford. With a Select Basic Bibliography on Renaissance Rhetoric*. New York: Garland, 1981.

Murphy, James J. *Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric*. Berkeley: U of California, 1978.

Murphy, James. *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*. Berkeley: U of California, 1983.

Novikova, Nina. "Poetika i ritorika v Kievo-Mogilianskoi akademii." *Russkaia rech* 6 (1987): 93–97.

Oksenberg Rorty, Amélie. *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1996.

O'Malley, John W. *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome: Rhetoric, Doctrine and Reform in the Sacred Orations of the Papal Court, c. 1450–1521*. Durham: Duke UP, 1979.

Petrov, Nikolai. "Iz istorii gomiletiki v staroi Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii." *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* (1886) 1: 86–124.

Roston, Murray. *The Soul of Wit: A Study of John Donne*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1974.

Ryan, Eugene. *Aristotle's Theory of Rhetorical Argumentation*. Montréal: Éditions Bellarmin, 1984.

Schleiner, Winifred. *The Imagery of John Donne's Sermons*. Providence: Brown UP, 1970.

Schwartz, Joseph, ed. *The Province of Rhetoric*. New York: Ronald P, 1965.

Stratii, Iaroslava. *Opisanie kursov filosofii i ritoriki professorov Kievo-Mogilianskoi akademii*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1982.

Taylor, Larissa. *Soldiers of Christ: Preaching in Late Medieval and Reformation France*. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

Vickers, Brian. *Rhetoric Revalued: Papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric*. Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1982.

Vitanza, Victor J. *Writing Histories of Rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1994.

Vomperskii, Valentin. *Ritoriki v Rossii XVII–XVIII vv.* Moscow: Nauka, 1980.

Weaver, Richard. *Language is Sermonic*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1970.

13. Sacred Philology, Scriptures, Theology

Augustine. *The Catholic and Manichaean Ways of Life* [*De moribus catholicae et de moribus manichaeorum*]. Trans. Donald A. Gallagher and Idella J. Gallagher. Washington: Catholic U of America P, 1966.

Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650–c.1450: Selected Sources. Trans. Janet Hamilton and Bernard Hamilton. New York and Manchester: Manchester UP , 1998.

Fedorov, Ivan. *Bukvar*. Facsimile edition: *Bukvar Ivana Fedorova*. Ed. I. Boriak. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1975.

Fitzmeyer, Joseph. *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 2 vols.

Gavin, Frank. *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought*. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Jacobus de Voragine, *Jacobi a Voragine Legenda aurea vulgo Historia lombardica dicta* [*Legenda aurea*]. Osnabruck: Otto Zeller, 1965.

Jedin, Hubert. *A History of the Council of Trent*. Trans. Ernest Graf. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961.

Klauser, Theodor. *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*. Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1950. 18 vols.

Krashkevich, John, ed. *The Orthodox Prayer Book*. 3rd ed. South Canaan: St. Tikhon's P, 1975.

Kuev, Kujo. *Azbuchna molitva v slavianskite literaturi*. Sofia: Bulgarska akademiia na naukite, 1974.

Lunt, Horace. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. 6th ed. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1974.

Meyendorff, John. *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. New York: Fordham UP, 1974.

Meyendorff, John. "*Eph ho* chez Cyrille d'Alexandre et Theodoret."*Studia Patristica* 79 (1961): 157–61.

Meyendorff, John. *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and Its Role in the World Today*. Trans. John Chapin. New York: Pantheon, 1962.

Montalbano, Frank. "Canaanite Dagon: Origin, Nature." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 13 (1951): 381–97.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600) = The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* 1. Chicago: U of Chigaco P, 1971.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700) = The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* 2. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1974.

Pomazansky, Michael. *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology: A Concise Exposition*. Trans. Seraphim Rose. Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1984.

Service Book of the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church. Trans. Isabel Hapgood. Englewood: Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of North America, 1975.

Strong, James. *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon P, 1983.

Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrid. *Tolkovanie na Evangeliie [Blagovestnik]*. Moscow, 1649.

Appendix

A. The alphabet according to the 1842 Collected Works:

1. Under the letter А:

> I, of Adam's nature, advise you, also of Adam's nature, to be humble. Being of Adam's nature, be humble, remembering the righteous pronouncement that was proclaimed: "for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shall return." [468]

2. Under the letter Б:

> Know God and understand his good works. Walk according to his commandments, so that you may inherit eternal goodness.[469]

3. Under the letter В:

> Believe in God, and believe God. At all times have temperance in all things. Always remember death and the passing of all things. Do not be at all of this world.[470]

4. Under the letter Г:

> Beware of every sin, great and small. At all times keep your own transgression before your eyes, so that each day you diligently strive for repentance.[471]

---

[468] «Азъ, Адама естества сый, тевѣ обоего пола естества Адамля, совѣтую: смиренъ буди. Адамля естества сый, смиренъ буди, памятствуя праведнаго осужденія слово реченное: яко земля еси, и въ землю паки пойдеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[469] «Бога познавай, благодѣянія его разумѣй, въ заповѣдехъ его ходи, да наслѣдникъ будеши вѣчныхъ благъ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[470] «Вѣруй въ Бога, вѣруй Богу, воздержаніе всегда въ всемъ имѣй, присно памятствуй смерть, и всѣхъ вещей измѣненіе, и ни единымъ чимъ ятъ будеши въ мірѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[471] «Грѣха от мала даже до велика блюдися, грѣхъ твой пред очима всегда имѣй, яко да усерднѣ на всякъ день прилѣжиши покаянію»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

5. Under the letter д:

> Day after day ascend the mountain of good deeds. Every day apply zeal upon zeal, so that you always walk the pathways of truth.[472]

6. Under the letter є:

> For the virtuous man there is hope, and each man's labor and struggle will be rewarded with eternal rest and happiness in the age to come.[473]

7. Under the letter ж:

> At all times remember eternal life and the coming goodness, so that you occupy your heart with this always.[474]

8. Under the letter Ѕ:

> Be very careful and diligent in your position and in yourself, lest you waste your life in vain.[475]

9. Under the letter з:

> Behold the created world, and marvel, and glorify the Creator of the world. Do not place your sensibilities in the created world, rather, direct your heart and soul to God the Creator.[476]

10. Under the letter и:

> To him who has zeal for goodness, it shall be given, "but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath" (Matt. 25.29).[477]

---

[472] «День от дне къ горѣ добродѣтелей восходи; усердіе ко усердію непрестанно на всякъ день прилагай, да утравиши тебе во вся стези правы»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[473] «Есть бо благимъ надежда, и всякому труду и подвигъ вѣчной покой и веселіе, въ грядущемъ вѣцѣ возмездіе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[474] «Жизнь вѣчную, и грядущая благая присно да поминаеши, яко да къ симъ всегда взимаеттися сердце»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[475] «Зѣло тщасливъ и усерденъ во твоемъ званіи и своествѣ [in the 1741 edition: должности] буди, яко да не всуе изнуряеши твою жизнь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[476] «Зря тварь, чудися, и Творцу твари славословіе приноси, не къ твари прилагай твоя чувства, но къ Богу Творцу всѣхъ сердце и душу возводи»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

[477] «Иже о благомъ имать усердіе, дастся ему: а иже не имать, и еже мнится имѣяй, возмется от него»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 290.

11. Under the letter I:

> Love truth, and beware of all kinds of iniquity, so that escape the words of the prophet: "Thou shalt destroy them that speak iniquity" (Ps. 5.6).[478]

12. Under the letter К:

> At all times unceasingly direct your mind and soul to God, and at no time let him out of your heart and memory, so that always you shall be as one with him.[479]

13. Under the letter Л:

> Endeavor to love God with all your heart and with all your strength, so that you come to know your salvation, and liberate yourself from all earthly passions.[480]

14. Under the letter М:

> Apply yourself to prayer without ceasing, for this is a treasure that cannot be stolen; it is the ladder by which you ascend to God.[481]

15. Under the letter Н:

> Do not apply your heart to earthly things, lest you become like salt that has lost its savor, lest you present yourself completely indecent. Instead, nail your heart and soul to God alone, so that you are immovable in your love for him.[482]

---

[478] «Истину люби, всякія лжи блюдися, да убѣжиши пророческаго реченія: погубиши всякаго глаголющаго лжу»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291. Note that in Dymytrii's alphabet the two Slavonic characters I and И are interchangeable being assigned the corresponding words *"izhe"* and *"istina"* This may reflect the normalization of these alphabet characters to conform with Russian pronunciation.

[479] «Къ Богу всегда умъ твой и душу непрестанно возводи, и никогдаже его от сердца и памяти твоей испускай, яко да всегда съ нимъ соединенъ будеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[480] «Любити Бога от всего сердца твоего, и от всея крѣпости твоея потщися: яко да извѣстенъ спасенія твоего будеши, и всякаго пристрастія земнаго свободишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[481] «Молитвѣ непрестанно прилѣжи, то бо есть некрадомое сокровище, еюже удобь, яко лѣствицею, къ Богу взыйдеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[482] «Не прилагай сердца твоего къ земнымъ, да не яко соль обуяеши, и весь непотребенъ явишися, но къ Богу единому сердце и душу твою пригвожденну имѣй, яко да неподвижимь въ любви его пребудеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

16. Under the letter О:

> For he is the one Lord, the source of all goodness, and the giver of eternal life.[483]

17. Under the letter П:

> Always remember the Lord. At all times may his name be in your heart and upon your lips. Always endeavor for repentance, and every day bathe your soul in warm tears, that you should appear whiter than snow, and not appear before the Lord with a face covered in shame.[484]

18. Under the letter Р:

> As often as possible zealously raise your hands in prayer to God. Finding your help in this, you shall defeat the mind's Amalek, that is, the devil.[485]

19. Under the letter С:

> Remembering death, beware of stinginess and parsimony. Let not your faithlessness and stinginess accompany you at the time of your passing, lest you shut yourself out from the doors of Divine Mercy.[486]

20. Under the letter Т:

> Be meek, unassuming, and humble to all, so thus you shall be recognized as a true follower and disciple of Christ, without blemish.[487]

---

[483] «Онъ бо есть единъ Господь, источникъ всѣхъ благъ и вѣчныя жизни податель»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[484] «Памятствуй о Господѣ выну, въ сердцѣ и во устѣхъ твоихъ да пребываетъ имя его всегда. Покаянію присно прилѣжи, и на всякъ день теплѣ слезами омывай душу твою, да убѣлишися паче снѣга, и не посрамленъ лицемъ пред Господемъ явишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[485] «Руцѣ твои къ Богу наичастѣе въ молитвѣ воздѣвай усерднѣ, оттуду помощи всегда взыскуя, да побѣдиши мысленнаго амалика, сирѣчь, діавола»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[486] «Смерть памятствуя, скупости и стѣсненія блюдися, да не невѣріемъ и скупостію ятъ бывши во время исхода, милосердія Божія дбери себѣ затвориши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

[487] «Тихъ, безтщеславенъ и кротокъ ко всѣмъ бывай, яко да истиненъ Хрістовъ подражатель и ученикъ безпорока явишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 291.

21. Under the letter У/ОV:

> If you wish to gain anon the eternal treasure, then guard yourself against languor and idleness.[488]

22. Under the letter У/ОV:[489]

> Be always zealous and warm unto the Lord, so that you may participate in the life eternal.[490]

23. Under the letter Ф:

> Struggle to drown the mind's Pharaoh in the water of your tears, so that he does not forever assault you, persecuting you.[491]

24. Under the letter Х:

> Seek Christ only, so that you dwell with him in eternity. They that seek him shall find great loving kindness, and they shall not want for any good thing (Ps. 34.10).[492]

25. Under the letter O^{T}:[493]

> Know your father and mother, friends and kin; know God and know yourself. For he is the beginning of life and the end of all that is without end.[494]

26. Under the letter Ц:

> May the Lord alone be your goal and your refuge. May his most holy love be your hope and confidence.[495]

---

[488] «Унынія и лѣности зѣло хранися, аще хощеши вскорѣ снискати вѣчное сокровище»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[489] The 1842 edition of the *Alphabet* gives the letter У/ОV twice. As proposed in fn. 122 above, it is possible that the author may have been playing withPythagorean symbolic values.

[490] «Усерденъ и теплъ къ Богу присно буди, да причастникъ будеши вѣчныя жизни»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[491] «Фараона мысленнаго въ водѣ слезной потопити тщися, да не всегда ратуя гонитъ тя»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[492] «Хріста единаго взыскуй, да съ нимъ пребудеши во вѣки. Взыскующіи бо его обрящутъ велію милость, и не лишатся всякаго блага»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[493] Several versions of the "Prayer of Constantine" use the superscript variant O^{T} rather than the omega ω variant. See the example in Kujo Kuev, *Azbuchnata molitva v slavianskite literaturi* 206

[494] «Отца и матерь, други и сродники, и Бога быти себѣ знай: онъ бо есть жизни начало, и конецъ всѣмъ безконечный»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[495] «Цѣль твоя и пристанище Господь единъ да будетъ, надежда же и упованіе, пресвятая его любовь»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

27. Under the letter ч:

> Truly love purity and chastity, for the pure adhere themselves to the pure One. Do not forget to repent regularly, lest you fail to correct yourself at the appointed time.[496]

28. Under the letter ш:

> Let these six-winged virtues always be companion to your soul: (1) diligence, (2) love of others, (3) patience, (4) the image of goodness, (5) reasoning, (6) and love, so that by means of them it should be proper that you raise yourself up to heaven.[497]

29. Under the letter щ:

> Be generous and kind to all, so that on the day of final judgement you will present your soul to the Lord in kindness and goodness. Keep this one thing in your memory at all times, so that you please God always, and that you forever ascend to him in love.[498]

30. Under the letter ю:

> Cast out from yourself your youthful, desirous, passionate follies. Rather, at all times zealously apply yourself to the Divine wisdom of God.[499]

31. Under the letter я:

> Be very careful of rage, anger, and malediction, lest the eye of your heart becomes obscured.[500]

---

[496] «Чистоту и цѣломудріе истинно возлюби, да прилѣпишися чистѣ чистому: и часъ от часа покаянія не отлагай, да не погубиши времене исправленія всуе во время часа»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[497] «Шестокрилни добродѣтели, водруженни въ души твоей всегда да будутъ: сирѣчь, усердіе, друголюбіе, терпѣніе, образъ благъ, разсужденіе, и любовь, имже удобъ на небо возвысишися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[498] «Щедръ и милостивъ ко всѣмъ буди, да милостива и благоутробна Господа въ день страшнаго суда душѣ твоей обрящеши. Едино се въ памяти своей имѣти выну, да Богу единому всегда угождаеши, и къ нему любовію присно да восходиши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[499] «Юностное похотное плотское безуміе от себе отметай, премудрости же духовныя о Бозѣ всегда поучайся всеусерднѣ»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[500] «Ярости, гнѣва и злословія зѣло блюдися, да не помрачиттися сердечное око»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

32. Under the letter ω:

> Be very careful of gluttony and drunkenness, lest you completely succumb to evil forever.[501]

33. Under the letter О҆:[502]

> Do not forsake the instruction of your spiritual father, lest you stumble along your paths.[503]

34. Under the letter Ψ:

> Glorify God in psalms and hymns without ceasing, may this always be a comfort unto you.[504]

35. Under the letter θ:

> Be very careful of pharisaic, conceited hypocrisy, lest you pay the price for your vanity, instead of being rewarded for your goodness.[505]

B. The alphabet according to the 1741 Kyiv edition:

1. Under the letter А:

> I, of Adam's nature, advise you, also of Adam's nature, to be humble. Being of Adam's nature, be humble, remembering the righteous pronouncement that was proclaimed: "for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shall return." [506]

---

[501] «Обяденія и піянства зѣло блюдися, да не во вся злая впадаеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[502] Note that in the 1842 alphabet the letter O is given twice (i.e. O and О҆), and long ω is also given twice in the form of the Greek omega character and in the superscript variant o^{T}. This compares with the four O characters in Ivan Fedorov's *Bukvar* [*Primer*] (L'viv,1574) and in K. Istomin's *Bukvar* [*Primer*] (Moscow, 1696) (see below). Also, in the 1842 alphabet the letter "ksi" (Ѯ) is missing, it normally preceeds Ψ.

[503] «Отеческаго духовнаго наказанія не преобижай, да не въ стезяхъ твоихъ преткнешися»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[504] «Псалмы и пѣсньми Бога безпрестанно славослови, да присно сіе имаши себѣ во утѣшеніе»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[505] «Фарісейскаго тщеславнаго лицемѣрія зѣло блюдися, да не восплащеніе твоихъ благъ себѣ тщеславіемъ здѣ мзду воспріимеши»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 293.

[506] «Азъ, Адама естества сый, тевѣ обоего пола естества Адамля, совѣтую: смиренъ буди. Адамля естества сый, смиренъ буди, памятствуя праведнаго

2. Under the letter Б:

> Know God and understand His good works. Walk according to His commandments, so that you may inherit eternal goodness.[507]

3. Under the letter В:

> Believe in God, and believe God. At all times have temperance in all things. Always remember death and the passing of all things. Do not be at all of this world.[508]

4. Under the letter Г:

> Beware of every sin, great and small. At all times keep your own transgression before your eyes, so that each day you diligently strive for repentance.[509]

5. Under the letter Д:

> Day after day ascend the mountain of good deeds. Every day apply zeal upon zeal, so that you always walk the pathways of truth.[510]

6. Under the letter Є:

> For the virtuous man there is hope, and each man's labor and struggle will be rewarded with eternal rest and happiness in the age to come.[511]

осужденія слово реченное: яко земля еси, и въ землю паки пойдеши»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* (Kyiv, 1751), fol. 15r.

[507] «Бога познавай, благодѣянія его разумѣй, въ заповѣдехъ его ходи, да наслѣдникъ будеши вѣчныхъ благъ»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 15r.

[508] «Вѣруй въ Бога, вѣруй Богу, воздержаніе всегда въ всемъ имѣй, присно памятствуй смерть, и всѣхъ вещей измѣненіе, и ни единымъ чимъ ятъ будеши въ мірѣ»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 15r.

[509] «Грѣха от мала даже до велика блюдися, грѣхъ твой пред очима всегда имѣй, яко да усерднѣ на всякъ день прилѣжиши покаянію»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 15v.

[510] «Денъ от дне къ горѣ добродѣтелей восходи, усердіе ко усердію непрестанно на всякъ денъ прилагай, да утравиши тебе во вся стези правы»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 15v.

[511] «Есть бо благимъ надежда, и всякому труду и подвигъ вѣчной покой и веселіе, въ грядущемъ вѣцѣ возмездіе»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 15v.

7. Under the letter Ж:

> At all times remember eternal life and the coming goodness, so that you occupy your heart with this always.[512]

8. Under the letter Ѕ:

> Be very careful and diligent in your position and in yourself, lest you waste your life in vain.[513]

9. Under the letter З:

> Behold the created world, and marvel, and glorify the Creator of the world. Do not place your sensibilities in the created world, rather, direct your heart and soul to God the Creator.[514]

10. Under the letter И:

> To him who has zeal for goodness, it shall be given, "but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath" (Matt. 25.29).
>
> Love truth, and beware of all kinds of iniquity, so that escape the words of the prophet: "Thou shalt destroy them that speak iniquity" (Ps. 5.6).[515]

11. Under the letter К:

> At all times unceasingly direct your mind and soul to God, and at no time let Him out of your heart and memory, so that always you shall be as one with Him.[516]

---

[512] «Жизнь вѣчную, и грядущая благая присно да поминаеши, яко да къ симъ всегда взимаеттися сердце»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 16r.

[513] «Зѣло тщасливъ и усерденъ во твоемъ званіи и должности буди, яко да не всуе изнуряеши твою жизнь»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 16r.

[514] «Зря тварь, чудися, и Творцу твари славословіе приноси, не къ твари прилагай твоя чувства, но къ Богу Творцу всѣхъ сердце и душу возводи»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 16r.

[515] «Иже о благомъ имать усердіе, дастся ему: а иже не имать, и еже мнится имѣяй, возмется от него

Истину люби, всякія лжи блюдися, да убѣжиши пророческаго реченія: погубиши всякаго глаголющаго лжу»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 16v. Whereas the1842 version considers the two characters I and И interchangeable, the 1741 version discards the character entirely. Again, this may reflect the normatlization of the alphabet characters to conform with Russian pronunciation.

[516] «Къ Богу всегда умъ твой и душу непрестанно возводи, и никогдаже его от сердца и памяти твоей испускай, яко да всегда съ нимъ соединенъ будеши»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 16v.

12. Under the letter Л:

> Endeavor to love God with all your heart and with all your strength, so that you come to know your salvation, and liberate yourself from all earthly passions.[517]

13. Under the letter М:

> Apply yourself to prayer without ceasing, for this is a treasure that cannot be stolen; it is the ladder by which you ascend to God.[518]

14. Under the letter Н:

> Do not apply your heart to earthly things, lest you become like salt that has lost its savor, lest you present yourself completely indecent. Instead, nail your heart and soul to God alone; so that you are immovable in your love for Him.[519]

15. Under the letter О:

> For He is the one Lord, the source of all goodness, and the giver of eternal life.[520]

16. Under the letter П:

> Always remember the Lord. At all times may His name be in your heart and upon your lips. Always endeavor for repentance, and every day bathe your soul in warm tears, that you should appear whiter than snow, and not appear before the Lord with a face covered in shame.[521]

---

[517] «Любити Бога от всего сердца твоего, и от всея крѣпости твоея потщися: яко да извѣстенъ спасенія твоего будеши, и всякаго пристрастія земнаго свободишися»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 16v.

[518] «Молитвѣ непрестанно прилѣжи, то бо есть некрадомое сокровище, еюже удобь, яко лѣствицею, къ Богу взыйдеши»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 17r.

[519] «Не прилагай сердца твоего къ земнымъ, да не яко соль обуяеши, и весь непотребенъ явишися, но къ Богу единому сердце и душу твою пригвожденну имѣй, яко да неподвижимь въ любви его пребудеши»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 17r.

[520] «Онъ бо есть единъ Господь, источникъ всѣхъ благъ и вѣчныя жизни податель»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 17r.

[521] «Памятствуй о Господѣ выну, въ сердцѣ и во устѣхъ твоихъ да пребываетъ имя его всегда. Покаянію присно прилѣжи, и на всякъ день теплѣ слезами омывай душу твою, да убѣлишися паче снѣга, и не посрамленъ лицемъ пред Господемъ явишися»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 17v.

17. Under the letter Р:

As often as possible zealously raise your hands in prayer to God. Finding your help in this, you shall defeat the mind's Amalek, that is, the devil.[522]

18. Under the letter С:

Remembering death, beware of stinginess and parsimony. Let not your faithlessness and stinginess accompany you at the time of your passing, lest you shut yourself out from the doors of Divine Mercy.[523]

19. Under the letter Т:

Be meek, unassuming, and humble to all, so thus you shall be recognized as a true follower and disciple of Christ, without blemish.[524]

20. Under the letter у/оѵ:

If you wish to gain anon the eternal treasure, then guard yourself against languor and idleness.

Be always zealous and warm unto the Lord, so that you may participate in the life eternal.[525]

21. Under the letter Ф:

Struggle to drown the mind's Pharaoh in the water of your tears, so that he does not forever assault you, persecuting you.

---

[522] «Руцѣ твои къ Богу наичастѣе въ молитвѣ воздѣвай усерднѣ, оттуду помощи всегда взыскуя, да побѣдиши мысленнаго амалика, сирѣчь, діавола»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov], *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 17v.

[523] «Смерть памятствуя, скупости и стѣсненія блюдися, да не невѣріемъ и скупостію ятъ бывши во время исхода, милосердія Божія дбери себѣ затвориши»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 17v.

[524] «Тихъ, безтщеславенъ и кротокъ ко всѣмъ бывай, яко да истиненъ Хрістовъ подражатель и ученикъ безпорока явишися»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 18r.

[525] «Унынія и лѣности зѣло хранися, аще хощеши вскорѣ снискати вѣчное сокровище.

Усерденъ и теплъ присно къ Богу буди, да причастникъ будеши вѣчныя жизни»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 18r.

> Be very careful of pharisaic, conceited hypocrisy, lest you pay the price for your vanity, instead of being rewarded for your goodness.[526]

22. Under the letter Х:

> Seek Christ only, so that you dwell with him in eternity. They that seek Him shall find great loving kindness, and they shall not want for any good thing (Ps. 34.10).[527]

23. Under the letter Ц:

> May the Lord alone be your goal and your refuge. May His most holy love be your hope and confidence.[528]

24. Under the letter Ч:

> Truly love purity and chastity, for the pure adhere themselves to the pure One. Do not forget to repent regularly, lest you fail to correct yourself at the appointed time.[529]

25. Under the letter Ш:

> Let these six-winged virtues always be companion to your soul: (1) diligence, (2) love of others, (3) patience, (4) the image of goodness, (5) reasoning, (6) and love, so that by means of them it should be proper that you raise yourself up to heaven.[530]

---

[526] «Фараона мысленнаго въ водѣ слезной потопити тщися, да не всегда ратуя гонитъ тя.

Фарісейскаго тщеславнаго лицемѣрія зѣло блюдися, да не восплащеніе твоихъ благъ себѣ тщеславіемъ здѣ мзду воспріимеши»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 18r–18v.

[527] «Хріста единаго взыскуй, да съ нимъ пребудеши во вѣки. Взыскующіи бо его обрящутъ велію милость, и не лишатся всякаго блага»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 18v.

[528] «Цѣль твой [sic] и пристанище Господь единъ да будетъ, надежда же и упованіе, пресвятая его любовь»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 18v.

[529] «Чистоту и цѣломудріе истинно возлюби, да прилѣпишися чистѣ чистому. Часъ от часа покаянія не отлагай, да не погубиши времене исправленія всуе во время часа»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 19r.

[530] «Шестокрилны добродѣтели, водруженни въ души твоей всегда да будутъ: сирѣчь, усердіе, друголюбіе, терпѣніе, образъ благъ, разсужденіе, и любовь, имже удобъ на небо возвысишися»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 19r.

26. Under the letter Щ:

> Be generous and kind to all, so that on the day of final judgement you will present your soul to the Lord in kindness and goodness. Keep this one thing in your memory at all times, so that you please God always, and that you forever ascend to Him in love.[531]

27. Under the letter Ю:

> Cast out from yourself your youthful, desirous, passionate follies. Rather, at all times zealously apply yourself to the Divine Wisdom of God.[532]

28. Under the letter Я:

> Be very careful of rage, anger, and malediction, lest the eye of your heart becomes obscured.[533]

29. Under the letter ω:

> Be very careful of gluttony and drunkenness, lest you completely succumb to evil forever.[534]

30. Under the letter Ѿ:[535]

> Know your father and mother, friends and kin; know God and know yourself. For He is the beginning of life and the end of all that is without end.
>
> Do not forsake the instruction of your spiritual father, lest you stumble along your paths.[536]

---

[531] «Щедръ и милостивъ ко всѣмъ буди, да милостива и благоутробна Господа въ день страшнаго суда душѣ твоей обрящеши. Едино се въ памяти своей имѣти выну, да Богу единому всегда угождаеши, и къ нему любовію присно да восходиши»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 19r.

[532] «Юностное похотное плотское безуміе от себе отметай, премудрости же духовный о Бозѣ всегда поучайся всеусерднѣ»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 19v.

[533] «Ярости, гнѣва и злословія зѣло блюдися, да не помрачиттися сердечное око»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 19r.

[534] «Обяденія и піянства зѣло блюдися, да не во вся злая впадаеши»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 19r.

[535] Note that in the 1741 the letter O is given three times (i.e. O, Ѿ and ω). Compare this with the four O characters in Fedorov's *Primer* and Istomin's (see below). As in the 1842 version, the letter "ksi" (Ѯ) in 1741 is also missing.

[536] «Отца и матерь, други и сродники, и Бога быти себѣ знай: онъ бо есть жизни начало, и конецъ всѣмъ безконечный.

Отеческаго духовнаго наказанія не преобижай, да не въ стезяхъ твоихъ преткнешися»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 19v.

31. Under the letter Ψ:

> Glorify God in psalms and hymns without ceasing, may this always be a comfort unto you.[537]

C. The alphabet according to Ivan Fedorov's *Primer* (*Bukvar* , L'viv: 1574):

а б в г д є
ж s z з и і
к л м н о п
р с т у оу ф
х ѿ ц ч ш щ
ъ ы ь ѣ є̂̀ ю
я о̂ ѧ ѽ
ѱ ѯ ѫ
ѳ ѵ

D. The alphabet According to K. Istomin's *Primer* (*Bukvar*, Moscow: 1696):[538]

а б в г д є ж s
з z и ї к л м н
о п р с т оу ф
х ѿ ц ч ш щ ъ
ы ь ѣ є ю ѫ ѽ
я ω ѧ ѯ ѱ ѳ ѵ

---

[537] «Псалмы и пѣсньми Бога безпрестанно славослови, да присно сіе имаши себѣ во утѣшеніе»—[Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov] *Alfavit dukhovnyi* fol. 19v.

[538] Okenfuss, plate V-3.

The 1842 and 1741 editions of Dymytrii's *Alphabet* compare with both Fedorov's *Primer* and Istomin's. Although in these editions several characters are omited (the jus characters ѧ and ѫ, the ligature ѥ, and the "ksi" character ѯ) the o character is repeated four times (o) (ω) (o^{T}) and (ȍ), comparable to the four characters supplied by Fedorov and Istomin (o) (ω) (ω^{T}) and (ȍ)/(ѽ). The irregularities found in the *Alphabet* may be the result of either Dymytrii (or this work's later editors) discarding characters not required for eighteenth-century Russian Church Slavonic pronunciation (the jus characters ѧ and ѫ, and the ligature ѥ; instead the characters я, ю, and є sufficed). This normalization is evident in the 1842 edition, where the Slavonic character ѳ is assigned its Russian pronunciation [f] rather than the Latinate [t] used in Kyiv during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Additionally, in both the 1842 and 1741 editions the characters и and і are not distinguished (the initial sounds of the words "izhe" and "istina" respectively), likely to conform with Russian pronunciation.

Other irregularities of the *Alphabet*, however, are not so easily explained. The ksi character (ѯ) is easily replaced by [кс], and may indeed have been discarded in order to simplify the alphabet. However, Dymytrii's (or the later editors') simplification of the alphabet through the omission of this character does not entirely make sense. If the only motivation was to simplify, the characters ѱ and ѳ could have been likewise discarded, as they are easily replaced by пс and ф.

What we see in the published editions of the *Spiritual Alphabet* is probably three things: (1) on one level, the normalization of the Church Slavonic alphabet to conform with eighteenth-century Russian orthography and pronunciation; (2) on a middle level, this alphabet may be a conscious refashioning of the alphabet to suit the needs of the educational sequence that follows; (3) and on another level, the author may be acknowledging the symbolic value accorded to these characters by seventeenth-century humanists, whose views on language were heavily influenced by neo-Pythagorean numerical and alphabetical symbolism.[539]

For example, in the 1842 edition the single character "uk" (ОѴ) is replaced with the "izhitsa" (Ѵ) character twice, this is comparable to Istomin's two characters (ОѴ) and (ѵ). If indeed this was Dymytrii's original intention (and not a modification by the texts' later editors) it is possible that he may have been playing with the symbolic associations accorded to the character "Y" by the neo-Pythagoreans. The two branches of the "Y" symbolized opposition: good and evil, virtue and temptation, etc. The two alphabet verses that accompany the double "izhitsa" entry begin with oppositional forces: languor and idleness begin the first "izhitsa" entry;[540] zeal and warmth begin the second.[541]

The symbolic value of a letter is also detected in the word values, i.e. the names assigned to each letter at the beginning of each alphabet letter's accompanying verse. Symbolic words have been assigned to each letter of the Slavonic alphabet since medieval times. Dymytrii's alphabet borrows some of these symbolic words from the normative Slavonic alphabet ("*nash* " = "ours"; "*slovo* " = "word"); some from the well-known "Alphabet Prayer of Constantine the Philosopher"[542] ("*Bog* " = "God"; "*Faraon* " = "Pharoah"); and some are evidently his own creations ("*verui* " = "believe"; "*istina* " = "truth"; "*liubov* " =

---

[539] For more on Neo-Pythagorean numerical and alphabetical symbolism see chapter four "Gnosticism, Hermetism, Neo-Platonism and Neo-Pythagoreanism: The Alphabet in the Hellenestic and Early Christian Era" in Johanna Drucker, *The Alphabetic Labyrinth: The Letters in History and Imagination* 72–92.

[540] «Унынія и лѣности зѣло хранися, аще хощеши вскорѣ снискати вѣчное сокровище»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[541] «Усердень и теплъ къ Богу присно буди, да причастникъ будеши вѣчныя жизни»—Dymytrii, Metropolitan of Rostov, *Sochineniia* 1: 292.

[542] By Dymytrii's time this prayer existed in many variants. See the proposed reconstruction in Kujo Kuev, *Azbuchnata molitva* 170–72.

"love"). Whatever Dymytrii's inventive sources may be, these alphabet characters likely reflect the Pythagorean symbolism that lies concealed beneath the text of the *Spiritual Alphabet* itself.

Thus, Dymytrii's approach to the alphabet is pedagogically practical, rhetorically organized and philosophically based. The letters of the alphabet themselves may serve as inventive material that the artist is free to rearrange. Thus the *Spiritual Alphabet* demonstrates that the Slavonic alphabet itself may be subject to rhetorical *dispositio*. Not only does the alphabet serve as the means by which the author organizes his book, it may also serve as an instrument of the writer's good arrangement and persuasive intent .